



Concordia Theological Monthly



F E B R U A R Y · 1 9 5 3

FEB 9

Concordia Theological Monthly

Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
the Managing Editor, F.E. Mayer, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER,
RICHARD R. CAEMMERER, THEODORE HOYER,
FREDERICK E. MAYER, ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN,
WALTER R. ROEHR.

CONTENTS

	FOR FEBRUARY 1953	PAGE
THE MARKS OF THE THEOLOGIAN. <i>Martin H. Franzmann</i>		81
THE ORDER OF MATINS. <i>Timothy Strelow</i>		94
THE GRACE OF GOD GIVES US CHRIST FOR JUSTIFICATION. <i>Gerhard Schulze — Kadelbach</i>		112
HOMILETICS		130
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER		140
BOOK REVIEW		156

Knox, John: Criticism and Faith. — Bucer, Martin: Instruction in Christian Love. — Orr, James: The Progress of Dogma. — Richardson, Allan: Creeds in the Making. — Seeberg, Reinbold: Textbook of the History of Doctrines. — Swaely, C. H.: The Lutheran Enterprise in India 1706 — 1952. — Madson, Norman A.: Preaching to Preachers. — Thurneysen, Edward: Die Lehre von der Seelsorge.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

nod

e of
Mo.

AGE

81

94

112

130

140

156

ctian
the
ely,
A.:

ing
nce

for
17,
S. A.

C

V

T

A

that
she
wor
gov
phe
have
a ch

A
man
to b
wise
to th
else,
Phil
drea
phil
telle
theo
and

*

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXIV

FEBRUARY 1953

No. 2

The Marks of the Theologian*

By MARTIN H. FRANZMANN

I

THE THEOLOGIAN AS A FOOL

1 Cor. 1:17-25

A STEWARDESS on a plane once asked me what I was. I answered, not quite without malice I am afraid, that I was a theologian. She didn't commit herself too strongly on that, merely opining that I was probably the first theologian that she had ever "carried"; but she seemed impressed. I have since wondered whether she should have been; by the standards that govern the creation of airlines and all the other streamlined paraphernalia, physical and spiritual, of our civilization, she shouldn't have been. For the theologian is by Biblical definition a fool, a child, and a slave; and they are not impressive entities.

A theologian is a fool; it is imperative that he be one: "Let no man deceive himself," St. Paul says: "if any man among you seemeth to be wise *in this world*, let him become a fool that he may be wise" (1 Cor. 3:18). We like to deceive ourselves well enough and to think that we have a choice between being fools and something else, after all. We all respond to the flattery of book lists headed *Philosophy and Theology* or *Religion and Philosophy*. We like to dream of some sort of connection, mild but still connubial, with philosophy. Luther's "Harlot Reason" tempts us to prove our intellectual virility and to seek for an "intellectually respectable" theology. We like to think of theology as "queen of the sciences" and of ourselves as very respectable little intellectual princelets in

* A series of chapel addresses, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

her train, with a Christian philosophy to place alongside all the other philosophies. But it is not so; theology is not queen, not among the sciences, and we are not princes. We are more like the short-pants boy who hovers on the fringe of the long-pants set; tolerated, but not ever really accepted. We should not deceive ourselves.

St. Paul shows us why we dare not deceive ourselves. To do so would be to take the heart out of theology, to take the Cross of Christ, the kernel, out of our *kerygma*. "Fool" therefore goes all up and down the line of theologians, from the little children in Christ up to St. Paul himself; he is speaking here of what Christ sent him, the Apostle, to proclaim, and it is foolishness.

The Gospel of the Cross of Christ is foolishness, and its practitioners are fools. The Gospel is God's last word to mankind; but it is somehow less impressive than His first word was: "After that in the *wisdom* of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." God's earlier attestation of Himself, the cosmic sketch of His power and His Godhead drawn in the works of His creation, outtops impressively this little fragment of a history of a few men clustered about a Man who taught in Galilee and died in Judaea. God's Law is more impressive than His Gospel, intellectually: "Do this, and thou shalt live" is a more demonstrable proposition than "Only believe, and thou shalt be saved." God once came with wisdom; He comes with folly, with the Cross. What kind of God, what kind of divine proclamation, is that?

The Gospel of the Cross does not fall into the same category with wisdom, with philosophy and science: over against "wisdom of words," the impressive truth clothed in impressive form, St. Paul can, for the first, only set something quite different and alien, "the power of God." The Cross of Christ will not satisfy the desire for intellectual mastery; it is an act of God, not deducible from premises, not reasonably explicable. It looms over mankind, not as an idea to be grasped, but as a life-or-death decision to be made. It cannot be demonstrated; it can only be proclaimed. The theologian does not fit among the searchers and the logical provers of this world.

The Gospel of the Cross is not only different; it is antithetical. It destroys the wisdom of the wise; it brings to nothing the under-

standing of the prudent; it makes foolish the wisdom of this world. The waves of this world's wisdom dash up against the Cross and break into a bitter spray that can only obscure it; the rainbow coruscations that appear, appear for a moment only and are gone. "Brilliant" theologies come, but they go also with monotonous regularity. For the antithesis will not down. Before the Cross vast sections of our libraries, huge areas of our civilization, recede into insignificance and irrelevance. And so the Cross acts also to exclude the wise. The scribe, the wise, the disputer of this world — where are they? Not under the Cross, not in the Church.

And so the poor Gospel of the Cross must wander helplessly up and down in the world, weak and foolish and indefensible: "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom"; and the Gospel of the Cross is neither. It is not a closed and symmetrical system, arguable and provable. A Greek mocker could call Jesus a "suspended sophist." Neither is it miraculously demonstrable. It is no obvious and inescapable act of divine power; it asks faith. A crucified Messiah is for the Jew a blasphemous thought, a conception unworthy of the Lord of Hosts. The Jew Trypho dismisses Jesus as honorless and gloryless, and to the Apostolic cry of "Jesus is Lord" there rises again and again the Jewish countercry, "Jesus is accursed!"

The Gospel of One who hung upon the tree is foolishness; and the foolishness is not peripheral. No scholarship can cover the nakedness of its folly, and no alliance with philosophy can make the Cross acceptable, for in the end there can be no alliance: either the Cross or philosophy must go. The theologian must *choose* to be a fool.

But before we take to feeling sorry for ourselves and begin slinking apologetically about the world, muttering about the Cross out of the corner of our mouths instead of shouting it from the house-tops, there is a question we should ask. Peter's opinion of Paul tells us more about Peter than it does about Paul: Who deems the Gospel of the Cross foolishness? Who is calling whom what?

They are the Jew and the Greek, and it should have become clear before now that they are always with us; they are not merely first-century phenomena. They are religious pride and intellectual pride. These are the moralistic scramblers up into heaven, who ascend step

by laborious step up strenuous ramps of performance to the throne of the Almighty and say: "Here we are; you must receive us." These are the subtle climbers-up of speculative spiral stairs of thought to a pale and anemic attic sort of God and ask: "Aren't you flattered that we've found you?" These are, each in his own way, the asserters of themselves; these are the picture-frame makers who have a frame all ready into which God must fit, or the worse for God. Our Jew (there is a piece of him in every one of us) must have a Messiah to reward him and to destroy his enemies. Our Greek will have a Savior who will give him a perspicacious conception of cosmic reality; he wants to master the world in his thought, instead of glorifying and thanking the Creator of the world. Both of them want the Kingdom of God, to be sure, but in *their* way, without repentance, without reversal, without denying themselves.

Where are they, the Jew and the Greek? Outside God's people. Their wisdom has separated them from God and shut them out from the truth of truths. They are the men whose wisdom God Himself has destroyed.

They are "of this world," this dying world; these are they that perish. These are dead men who call the Gospel of the Cross foolishness. It is as if the young man of Nain in last Sunday's Gospel had sat up and said: "What are your premises and your postulates? Your wisdom of words does not satisfy me." Or, to put it in Jewish terms, it is as if he had said: "You have come down a dusty road in Galilee like any one of dozens of hedge preachers; you have no white horse, no trumpets, no sword proceeding from your mouth to blast our enemies; you are no Messiah for my needs." It is as if that wise and theologically trained young man had said: "I'll not rise. I'll stay dead on my own terms rather than live on yours." Who is calling whom what?

The question of questions is not, after all, "How does it look to me or to any man?" The question is, "*Whose* foolishness is it?" We do better to start from there. The Cross is God's act, His love, His giving — Jesus was "savoring the things of God" when He went to the Cross. That removes it from the realm of demonstration and proof. It is not below but above logic and sign. — The Cross is a deed and a fact without all analogy; but God in the Old Testament and the Son of God in the New Testament used a mother's

love to give us a grasp of it, and we may too: We never asked our mothers to prove or demonstrate their motherhood, either logically or dramatically. My mother was innocent of syllogism, and it never occurred to me to ask her to jump into a well to prove her love for me. She had "proved" it before I ever knew it; she had borne me, nursed me, yearned over me long before I was aware of it. Her love was in my life: she fed me, clothed me, washed my ears, blew my nose, spanked me, and forgave me. Her love was not an arguable quantity; it was *there*, and her face was the most beautiful in the world because it was hers. She lived in my life, and I lived in hers.

And so it is with the Cross. The love of God that sent His son to Golgotha was there, and fixed on me, before the foundations of the world were laid. All history was shaped and guided to the Cross, for me. The Son of Man came to minister and to give His life a ransom, for me. He won deliverance, and victory, and peace, and access to God in confidence, for me. Unto us, unto me, He was born and lived and wrought and died and was raised by the glory of the Father, for me. That love of God was brought to me, given to me without my willing and running; I *was* baptized; I did not baptize myself.

It is all God's good will; it pleased Him thus to save them that believe, *all* that believe, Jew and Greek; they need *only* believe, need only let the Cross be theirs. God calls us, and we believe; we see ourselves and abhor ourselves in dust and ashes. The miasmatic mist of logic and sign is lifted, and we *see*; we see power and wisdom. Instead of strong and brittle logic, we have a powerful, leaping, and triumphant music. Instead of the infallible sign for which an evil and adulterous generation asks, the sign that will obviate the need of faith, we have the sign which looms victoriously over the Church of Jews and Greeks, the sign of the Cross, which is marvelous in our eyes and spells victory.

We shall not cease to be scholars; it would be sheer ingratitude to God, who gave us Greek and Hebrew and all other manifold skills wherewith we may seek Him where He may be found, if we did not use them to the uttermost. We shall not strike philosophy from our curriculum either; we shall study it diligently, for there

are Stoics and Epicureans in our market places, too, and we must become all things to all men that by all means we may win some. We must find men where they live and lead them thence to life eternal. But the theologian is not primarily a scholar, he does not set himself an ideal of scholarship; he becomes a scholar almost accidentally, by being a wholehearted theologian. And he is never in any sense a philosopher. He is a fool, and proud of it. Our prayer as theologians must always be:

Accept me, Lord, into Thy school,
And graduate me as Thy fool.

Amen

II

THE THEOLOGIAN AS A CHILD

Matt. 18:1-4

We have become God's fools; the wisdom and the strength of this world are eschewed, rejected, and forgotten—we think; we know and are sure. The door is closed and locked upon them. But the devil climbs through keyholes, and the Jew and Greek scramble through the transom after and are with us still. Worse yet, we find them within us, transformed and dignifiedly disguised, but the same old gentry, proud and pestilential. They make the question: "Who, *then*, is greatest?" seem a natural and logical question even here in the Kingdom, under the grace of God in Christ Jesus. The old heroic words of Achilles' tutor: "Ever to excel and to surpass all others," have power to charm us yet. And the old Pharisaic love for the front seats in the synagog and the first places at table—is it entirely gone, after all? We have gotten away from crude brass trumpets to blow before us; but a little woodwind obbligato is so nice, so genteel; and little, felted words like "due recognition" can be made to do the job.

And so we theologians need another sermon on a text for theologians. Our text *is* a text for theologians, spoken by our Lord to an advanced group and a select lot. The theology these men had had, the things they knew! They had heard John the Baptist cry: "Repent ye!" and heard him proclaim the Kingdom of God nigh at hand, the wrath to come, the axe laid to the root of the tree, the

judgment of God upon all impenitence and unbelief, including Pharisaic and Sadducean unbelief and impenitence; they had heard him proclaim the Greater One who was to come with Spirit and with fire, with judgment and with creative grace, to burn the chaff in fire unquenchable and to bring home into His barns the winnowed grain; they had heard him proclaim and point to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, God's complete and universal sacrifice for the sins of men; they had beheld the Baptist's joy made full: "He must increase; I must decrease." They had heard the call of the Greater One, Jesus of Nazareth; had heard His promise that He would make them fishers of men. They had heard the Sermon on the Mount — including the First Beatitude upon the poor in spirit; they had heard and sensed that unique authority in His words, words which proclaimed that the streams of mankind divide for eternal weal or woe around a rock that is none other than Himself. They had seen the leper cleansed, the storm stilled, the demons cast out by the Finger of God, the dead raised, the blind healed. They had been sent, commissioned, and empowered by Jesus to do great things in His name; they had heard the parables of the Kingdom, and to them it had been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens, to draw the line from the parable to the reality present in the word and work of Jesus of Nazareth. They had heard Jesus' answer to the Baptist when he sent to Him from prison; they had heard Jesus' claim to an unparalleled divine Sonship. They had confessed Him as the Christ, the Son of the living God; and to some of them it had been given to witness the Transfiguration.

They were crammed with good theology, and they knew it. They were in high spirits: Jesus had called them, the Kingdom was theirs. They felt confident and capable of occupying top places, of being great men before God. There was only one question still unsettled in their theology: "Who, *then*, is the greatest?" Jesus answers them: "Turn! Be converted!" Whoever asks the question of greatness is on the way out of the Kingdom, is throwing away God's gift. He must begin anew. The cry of the Old Testament Prophets to apostate Israel; the cry of John the Baptist to Sadducee and Pharisee, to all Israel; the cry of Jesus Christ to all men: "Repent! Turn! Turn away from yourselves and your sin, to God!" that cry is ad-

dressed to the theologians. Luther saw rightly: "When our Lord Jesus Christ says, 'Repent,' He wants our whole life to be repentance." Our new life, our life as theologians, is a reality only in our continued and ever-renewed turning from the old life. "The new man is always only one day old."

This is a radical word to be addressed to disciples, to theologians; and Jesus leaves us in no doubt as to its seriousness: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." The Kingdom is God acting, is God interposing in the person of His Christ. It is solely and wholly His deed; it is the stone made without hands which destroys all human kingdoms and fills the whole earth and leaves no room for human greatness. His will is done; His name is hallowed where He reigns. The disciples had not chosen God's Anointed; He had chosen them. They had not done His deeds or spoken His words; they had witnessed them and heard them and received them. It was given them to confess Jesus as the Christ; they did not make Him the Christ. They had not transfigured Jesus; they had witnessed the Transfiguration. The Kingdom is God's giving and leaves room only for our receiving.

Therefore it is for the children. The child is small and knows he is small (that is all that Jesus singles out in the child; He says nothing of his innocence, loveliness, or charm); the child is always looking up to persons greater than he; he cannot ever forget how small he is, and he has not yet learned to deceive himself into the belief that he is as big as anybody. The child receives. Children are the world's best askers and beggars; they are the world's best accepters of gifts and receivers of presents.—The finest characterization of our Lutheran Confessions is Schlink's, who says that they breathe the air of child's delight at having received a gift.

"Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." "Humble himself"—a child does not make himself smaller than he is; he knows how small he actually is. That is why turning, being converted, is a turning to childhood. That is why greatness comes to the childlike. The emptiest receives most; only he will be great for whom "greatness" has lost all meaning, for whom only God is great, as only God is good. God is Creator, and he works *ex nihilo*. He puts Himself

into selfless lives; He pours the wine of His gladness into empty cups; He fills empty hands; He justifies the ungodly and raises the dead.

When the brazen idol of *our* greatness has melted before the blaze of God's greatness and lies a little pool to reflect God's glory and the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, then we shall have begun to be Christians, then we have become at least apprentice theologians.

This is not an interlude, a subject for a ten minutes' "meditation" on a Thursday morning. This is a practical and decisive consideration. On this turning, this becoming children, our theology depends, practically. Our response to this word of our Lord will determine, for instance, what sort of exegetes we are going to be; will determine whether we are going to judge the Word of God or let it judge us; whether we shall set out to master the New Testament or let it master us. On our response depends the character of our exegetical scholarship; if we take Jesus' word seriously and become children, we shall have the only genuinely theological scholarship there is. Genuine theological scholarship is always a by-product: Because he is a child, a beggar and a receiver; because he is a listener; because he would let the Word master him; because he cries out to that Word: "*Doce me! Doce me! Doce me!*" — therefore the theologian shrinks from no task however long, tedious, or irksome in itself. The tangled briars of the *apparatus criticus* become his pleasant pastures. He masters languages with gusto; he settles *boti's* business, and the aorist is his oyster. He takes an insane delight in grammatical niceties; he is like a baying hound on trail in his pursuit of etymologies; he listens laboriously but raptly to tones and overtones in words. He soars like an eagle scanning the whole and its parts; he ransacks history for all that makes clear and bright and plastic the brave Biblical world; he walks with seven-league boots through all Scriptures that he may know the whole land; hits every key on the Biblical keyboard that he may stay attuned to its vibrations only. Our child, somewhat to his own surprise, has become a scientific exegete — at least if we accept Schlatter's brave definition of *Wissenschaft*: "Ich heisze Wissenschaft die Beobachtung des Vorhandenen, nicht den Versuch, sich vorzustellen, was nicht sichtbar ist." He takes all pains to see, but he is content to

see, without attempting to divine the invisible; for what he sees is God's plenty.

Be converted! Turn! Become as a little child. Accept God's royal reign. And so we shall become great, really great. We shall have risen on wings of thanksgiving to realms where the yapping of applause can no longer be heard and the yardsticks of greatness are too small to measure anything.

Turn Thou us, and we shall be turned!

Amen

III

THE THEOLOGIAN AS A SLAVE

Matt. 20:25-28

We can measure the total nature of sin by the total nature of the revolution wrought by the grace of God. The theological world is a topsy-turvy world: we turn fools in order to become wise; we turn children to become great; and today's text for theologians tells us that we must turn slaves to become princes. This text, too, is a text for theologians, for it is addressed to the Twelve, and particularly to the sons of Zebedee. James was so important a theologian that a king who sought the favor of the Pharisees by a pronouncedly pro-Jewish policy chose him as the first victim to be sacrificed to that policy and had him executed with the sword. He must have been a theologian of mark. And St. John the Theologian we all know, from his Gospel, his Letters, and the Apocalypse. This is a text for ambitious theologians, moreover, and for ready-to-die theologians, for men ready to be baptized with the baptism wherein with their Lord will be baptized and to drink the cup that He must drink.

To them our Lord says: "Be ministers! Be slaves!" This is in conscious, willed, and diametrical contrast to the standards of this world, where princes exercise dominion and the great exercise authority. Being prince, being great and strong, means being greater and stronger than somebody else, and the more somebody else, the better. Preferably everybody else. We recall Carlyle's dictum that it takes the whole universe, whole and undivided, to make one bootblack happy; if he has to share it with another bootblack, he deems

himself the most abused creature in the world. This is in direct opposition to the whole world of self-insistence, of honor, ambition, and nobility. "But it shall not be so among you." The great shall minister, and the chief shall serve. This is taking all the stitches out of the world's seams with a vengeance. If this stands, nothing else stands. What would happen if we began to take it with absolute seriousness, not in the world, but in the Church? And yet we must take it with absolute seriousness, for it is based and grounded on the fact that is the very center of the center of our theological existence, on the Son of Man, on the coming-in of the Kingdom of God, on the ultimate revelation of God: "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." This Son of Man of whom Daniel had seen the vision, the vision of One coming with the clouds of heaven, from the realm of God — "and there was given Him dominion and glory and a kingdom that all people, nations, and languages should serve Him; His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" — this Prince, this Great One, came to serve, to minister. He "came" for that end; His ministry and servitude is no accident of His existence, but is the purpose and content of His existence; in it is its significance; in Him is God's ultimate revelation of Himself, God's last and consummate word to man.

It is God's last word, the completion and the climax of all His words to men, words which revealed Him as the God who ministers: He created a world which He himself called good, at whose splendor and goodness the morning stars sang together and the sons of God shouted for joy, and gave it as a birthday gift to man, gave it to him to replenish and subdue it. He offered Himself to man for communion, to man made in His image for that communion. And when man broke that communion, it was He who set about to restore it. The angel with the fiery sword is not His last word even here; it is the Promise. He chose out a man and blessed him and entered into a covenant with him and with the people sprung from him: "I will be thy God." The whole history of that nation is no heroic account of Israel's greatness, but of a ministering God's goodness to a wayward people. He sent them His servants, the prophets, to woo and win them back to Him; He gave

them the Law to be a schoolmaster unto Christ for them. The Old Testament is the book of God's ministry to His people, and through His people to mankind. It is the song: "My well-beloved hath a vineyard," a vineyard which He loves and tends.

Of that revelation the Son of Man is the climax: "Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved, he sent him also last unto them." His name was called Jesus at His Father's behest: "For He shall save His people from their sins." His name already marked His servitude. At His birth the angels cried out to men: "Unto *you*." His acts were the enacted proclamation of the kingship of a King who ministers. His words were words of ministry: He is Life for the dead, Bread for the hungry, Light for those in darkness and the shadow of death, the Way and the Door by which men may come to God, the Shepherd who lays down His life for the sheep, the Son of Man who gives His life a ransom for many. He says: "Come unto Me!" "Thy sins be forgiven thee!" Even in His preaching of repentance, particularly in that preaching, in His rebukes, in His disputes, in His crying of "Woe!" He serves. "I am among you as he that serveth."

In all this He was "savoring the things of God"; it is no accident that Jesus uses "Son of Man" *both* in His highest claims to divine glory, to divine Judgeship, to Godhead, and in His depiction of His humiliation — "The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head" — and the predictions of His Passion and death. In all this the Kingdom of God is drawing nigh, the Kingdom of a ministering and giving God. In all this God is revealing Himself. In all this the only-begotten Son was "declaring" God.

When the Son of Man revealed God, He also "revealed" man; for man was made in the image of God, and that image is restored to sons of men in the Son of Man who gave His life for us. Man's greatness lies where God's glory lies, where the glory of the Son of Man lies, in ministry. In ministry, in servitude, we are full sons of God again. There can therefore be no such thing as a contemplative theologian; how shall we commune with this God whom the restlessly ministering Son of Man has revealed to us and sit still? Isaiah saw the Lord high and lifted up; his lips were cleansed by God's own action, from God's own altar; and the Lord said: "Whom shall I send?" When God revealed His Son in Paul, He did so, St. Paul himself tells us, "that I might preach Him to the Gentiles."

St. John beheld a vision on Patmos, and the voice said: "Write to the seven churches." These theologians ministered.

If we think to take God's wisdom and let it rest within us, a treasure for ourselves alone; if we think to reduce His action to a conception, His mighty arm to a picture in a stained-glass window, His Word to a powerful and delightful rhetoric that we can have and hold and quietly enjoy, it will burn like fire in our bones and destroy us. All theologians are ministers, whatever their professional title may happen to be; they are servants and slaves.

Conversely, this makes theologians of all who serve for His name's sake, however "untheological" their servitude may be; for all such glorify their Father who is in heaven—and the glory of God is the end of all theology.

Amen

St. Louis, Mo.

The Order of Matins

By TIMOTHY STRELOW*

I

The corporate worship of the Christian Church has always been associated with certain forms. The spirit of worship, of communion with God, in all ages has expressed itself in the use of various forms and orders of worship. It is, however, a fact that there are many who use these forms of worship with a great lack of appreciation or understanding. Often the so-called minor forms of worship are rejected. This negative attitude toward forms of worship may quite frequently be due to the gross mutilation of the pure forms. A negative attitude toward Matins may also be due to its use in a partial and piecemeal manner or to a continued faithfulness to tradition, which brings with it the danger of those forms appearing to us as something out of date, as forms that are alien and lifeless. In either case, the lack of appreciation for the forms of worship is usually due primarily to a lack of understanding. Matins, the chief of the Minor Services, is here considered and studied with the aim of being an aid to understanding this form of worship. This study will omit an analysis of any musical settings for Matins, as well as any detailed study of Psalmody or Hymnody in general apart from their distinct relation to, and importance in, Matins.

The ecclesiastical terminology by which the Order of Matins is known, namely, as one of the ancient Canonical Hours or as an Office, offers a point of contact with the historical past from which the origin of Matins may be traced and its development observed. The Order of Holy Communion is the Chief Service. Matins is a Minor Service or a Major Office as contrasted with other occasional Offices or Services. Matins, however, as an order that is supplementary to the Service, is both a beautiful form of worship as well

*The author is pastor of a mission in Dallas, Texas. He was graduated from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., in June, 1952, with the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. The article is a summary of the dissertation presented as partial fulfillment of the requirements for this degree.—ED.

as an historic form. Although the form of Matins experienced changes and stages of development during the centuries, its roots have their beginning in the days of the founding of the Church, which used this form of worship in its communion with God.

The beginning of the Canonical Hours may be traced to the ancient Jewish Hours of Prayer observed by the Jews at the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day, counting from sunrise to sunset. This observance of certain Hours of Prayer was directly related to the public and private worship of the Old Testament Jews. Centuries before the birth of Christ, David wrote in Psalm 55:17, "Evening, and morning, and at noon, will I pray, and cry aloud: and He shall hear my voice." Throughout the history of Israel we find certain pious Jews such as Daniel regularly observing such daily periods of prayer.¹ At the time of Christ these same Hours of Prayer were kept in the worship at the Temple. They were rich in formal character; they were expressive of the faith of the people of God in their God.

It is to be expected therefore that the early Christians would appropriate certain elements of the same into their corporate worship as well as into their private devotions. Historians give us proof that such was the case. We find references to these Hours and their use already in the Book of Acts. Peter² and John especially are mentioned in connection with the observance of "the hour of prayer."³ Also, such writers as Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, and Chrysostom, likewise the *Apostolic Constitutions*, all mention the Early Christians' use of the prayer hours.⁴

The Roman historian Cabrol believes that the origin of Matins stems from the Hours of Prayer and is also directly associated with the nocturnal Vigils of the Christians. Concerning the Vigils he writes:

Generally it designated the nightly meetings, *synaxes*, of the Christians. . . . The liturgical services of these *synaxes* was composed of almost the same elements as that of the Jewish Synagog: readings from the Books of the Law, singing of psalms, divers prayers.⁵

Following this was a Eucharistic Service, and within a short time there seemed to have developed an emphasis on more readings both from the canonical and noncanonical writings of the New Testa-

ment era.⁶ Cabrol believes this to be the beginning not only of Matins, but also of all the other canonical hours.

The Synaxes for which the early Christians assembled by night, consisted of the 'breaking of bread,' preceded by the singing of psalms and hymns, litanies and collects, readings, homilies, invocations and canticles. This was at one time the whole of the official liturgical prayer. From this somewhat crowded celebration . . . the Night Office (Matins, Lauds, and perhaps Vespers) came into existence, and afterward threw out, like stars of the second magnitude, Prime, Compline, and the Little Hours of the Day.⁷

Originally the name Matins itself, meaning literally "of the morning," was used of the Office now referred to as Lauds, which was at that time said at dawn. It was then applied to the Night Office referred to above.

The addition of these canonical hours to the worship life of the Christians seems to begin about the middle of the third century. Hippolytus in the early third century gave direction for private prayer at specific hours as a daily discipline and obligation of the faithful.⁸ But we are not told as to the number of these specific hours which were to be kept. Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian knew only of the regular practice of the three appointed hours.⁹ But by the fourth century seven canonical hours are in existence and are observed by the people, even when they were not yet officially appointed to be used regularly.¹⁰ In the *Apostolic Constitutions* we find that the bishops were exhorted to urge their people to assemble regularly at various times of the day, with the result that by the fourth century "the secular clergy and the laity therefore developed daily congregational services long before the complete system of Offices was perfected by the ascetics."¹¹ Various religious exercises were prescribed for the individual hours, for example, for Matins, meditation on the divine Word; Lauds, praise; Prime, supplication; Tierce, Sext, and Nones, hallowing the day, with special emphasis on the use of Psalm 119; Vespers, prayer, praise, and thanksgiving; Compline, prayer, and committing oneself to the Lord.¹²

There seems to be no doubt that gradually the emphasis shifted, especially in Matins, to a predominance of readings in these hours. Originally there were reading, singing, and praying, all three of

which seem to have been appropriated from the synagog worship of the Early Christians. With respect to the predominance of any of these three elements, Jungmann writes:

In the earliest days of the Church reading, song and prayer were more or less of equal prominence and importance. If there was any predominance it lay with the reading. . . . Already in comparatively early times, however, the readings began to hold a preponderance over psalmody and prayer.¹³

This was the situation up to approximately the fourth century. In this century, "concomitant with, and owing to, the spread of monasticism," the predominance shifted to the use of the Psalms, especially the antiphonal chanting of Psalms.¹⁴

The chief monastic contribution, however, to the development of Matins began with St. Benedict, who formulated and prescribed a complete system of Hours and their required observance. The Rule of St. Benedict of Nursia, about 529, established seven Hours with eight services, one of the Hours being a night Hour. The entire monastic system spread rapidly throughout the West, the monasteries becoming centers of culture, education, and charitable work. It is therefore easy to understand how the use of these Canonical Hours as prescribed by St. Benedict would spread and be adopted. In the same century Gregory the Great, who had been a monk, unified the monastic system still more.

The form of the various Hours, as established by St. Benedict and generally adopted by the time of Gregory, is essentially that which the Christian Church has used ever since, especially the Western Church. Basically St. Benedict rearranged and adapted the Hours to particular monastic requirements.

The central feature in each Office was the reading of a portion of the Psalter. To this were added the reading of Scripture, homilies, hymns, canticles, and prayers. Additional elements such as antiphons, versicles, responsories, etc., later enriched the services.¹⁵

The regular observance of these seven Hours as prescribed by St. Benedict could not of course be kept in any large degree by the common people. As a result, two of the Hours became primary in importance to the people, the morning and the evening hours, or Matins and Vespers. These were used continuously from the sixth

century down to the period of the Reformation. The weekday Matins usually contained one Nocturn, which included one group of chanted Psalms, three lessons, three responsories, and three collects. In contrast to this, Matins on Sundays and Festivals contained three Nocturns, which in turn included three groups of chanted Psalms, nine lessons, nine responsories, and nine collects.¹⁶

Very little change was made in the form of Matins, although in the course of the years various parts were greatly expanded or extended. Even "extracts from Expositions or Homilies of the Fathers, or Lives of the Saints" were included. "Hence, although the Lessons were numerous, but little Scripture was read."¹⁷

With the advance of the Reformation the question inevitably arose among the followers of Martin Luther as to whether or not the canonical hours including Matins and Vespers should be retained. While his comments on the breviary offices were always realistic and sometimes strongly critical, in general Luther spoke highly of all the Canonical Hours, but desired that especially Matins and Vespers should be retained. However, Luther favored the shortening or simplification of Matins. One of the chief effects of the Reformation on Matins was the introduction or addition of a sermon into the service. This was undoubtedly due to Luther's strong emphasis on the preaching of the Word. However, the sermon was usually included only on Sunday. In effect Luther's Matins became a combination of Matins, Lauds, and Prime, especially, however, of Matins and Lauds. Another development in the use of Matins in the Reformation period is the combined use of the vernacular together with the traditional ecclesiastical language in connection with the use of Psalms, lessons, and hymns.¹⁸

The use of Matins in the Reformation period was not confined to the church schools, although it was used there primarily. It was also used in simplified form for supplementary congregational services. This was true also of Church Order in other countries to which the Reformation had spread, such as those of Bugenhagen in north Germany and Denmark.¹⁹

The fact that Matins was used principally in the church schools but not in the congregations eventually resulted in a near loss of Matins to the congregations, particularly after disorganization caused by the Thirty Years' War. This was also partially due to the fact

that Matins was used not only in the vernacular, but large portions were also retained and sung in Latin. The liturgical degeneration which followed the Thirty Years' War continued throughout the following decades into the eras of Pietism and Rationalism. Neither Pietism nor Rationalism made any attempt to reintroduce Matins to its proper place in the liturgical life of Christians.

In the nineteenth century, the churchly revival succeeded in restoring Matins to deaconess motherhouses and similar religious communities in Europe, but was only occasionally successful in the restoration of congregational use of Matins.²⁰ Various efforts were undertaken for a liturgical restoration and reformation, which finally found their fruition in the publication of several liturgical books. The *Mecklenburg Cantionale* of 1867, the *Kirchenbuch* published by the General Council in 1877, and *The Common Service Book* of 1888 each included the Order of Matins for congregational use. The Missouri Synod's *Baltimore Hymnal* in 1892 also contained the order of Matins, but the "Grey Hymnal," published by the Missouri Synod in 1905, did not. In 1912, however, the Missouri Synod's *Evangelical Lutheran Hymn-book* again included Matins, as does the current *Hymnal of 1941*.

II

The following discussion of the various parts of Matins is primarily an analysis of the real nature and character of the individual part both in itself and also in its relation to the whole of the service.

The Hymn of Invocation

The rubric here permits the use of an opening hymn, although this seems to be inconsistent with the opening versicles which appear to be the actual beginning of the service proper. If a hymn must be used, it should be a hymn of praise, thanksgiving, prayer, or any hymn dealing with the morning or the opening of a service. If there is a choir, the hymn is sung by both the choir and the congregation. The general consensus of historical tradition seems to be that if there is a choir in Matins, there may also be a procession, either with or without the singing of a hymn.

Our rubrics imply that Matins will be said at the altar, with the officiant facing the altar for sacrificial acts, and the congrega-

tion for sacramental acts. Another viewpoint allows the officiant to conduct Matins from a clergy stall or prayer desk. Both views have some justification.

The general rubrics in existence today say nothing as to the place of the organ or its function in Matins, much less specifically for or against a prelude, postlude, and so forth. If a prelude is used, it should by all means be in keeping with the proper spirit of the entire service, the spirit of prayer and praise. Throughout the service the organ should be used in a way which will definitely aid in producing continuity and a devotional atmosphere in the service.

The Versicle and Gloria Patri

The congregation is here directed by the rubric to rise and remain standing to the end of the Venite. These opening versicles are the proper liturgical introduction to Matins. They may be said or sung. Consistency should prevail throughout the service. Historic tradition dictates that if one part of the service is said, all parts should likewise be said. Matins should either be said throughout, or be sung throughout, in which latter case it is called Choral Matins.

The first versicle is Psalm 51:15, and the second is Psalm 70:1. The Gloria Patri is based on various passages, such as Rom. 16:27, Eph. 3:21, Phil. 4:20, and Rev. 1:6. These versicles are definitely sacrificial, a prayer asking the Lord for aid in praising Him, a petition beseeching God to use His power in us to enable us to praise Him properly. It is most fitting to make this request in this first worship hour of the day.

In the second versicle we look forward more to the multiple activities of the day just beginning, to its evils and its duties, petitioning the Lord to deliver us from all the evils of the day and to help us in all the duties of the day. Only one verse of Psalm 70 is here used, whereas originally in monastic use the entire Psalm was repeated "on waking," or while going from the dormitory to the chapel.²¹ That brings us directly to the Gloria Patri. Historically the Gloria Patri came into use at this point due to its use at the conclusion of every Psalm. Thus Psalm 70 was followed by the Gloria Patri. When this Psalm was later shortened to only one verse, the Gloria Patri was nevertheless retained. Actually, however, the Gloria Patri is here a brief but definite and clear profession

of faith in the Holy Trinity as well as an unmistakable ascription of praise to the eternal God. Therefore its use at the beginning of the service of Matins is most appropriate. The Gloria Patri is concluded or followed with "Amen, Alleluia!" This combination of "Amen, Alleluia" is found in Ps. 106:48 and Rev. 19:4. The Alleluia, which is Hebrew for "Praise ye the Lord," again reverts back to the primary emphasis in Matins of praise.

The rubric directs that the Alleluia be omitted during the Penitential Seasons, such as Pre-lent and Lent. Anciently, at this time, was sung instead, "Praise be to Thee, O Lord, King of eternal glory."

The Invitatory

Having made the profession of faith in the Holy Trinity in the Gloria Patri, we now proceed in the service to worship and praise the eternal God. The first step toward this end is the Invitatory, which is a versicle composed of two parts issuing a call to worship. Properly speaking, the Invitatory must always be connected and used with the Venite. The Invitatory given in the Order of Matins is termed the Common Invitatory because it is common to a large number of occasions. It is based on verse six of Psalm 95, which is also the Venite. The first part is a clear invitation and exhortation to worship and praise the Lord, while the latter part gives the reason for such worship and praise. The Western Church has always used the Invitatory in a variable form. Some light may be shed on the historical use of the Invitatory and the origin of the various Proper Invitatories through the following explanation of the origin of the Invitatory. "It may have come into the Liturgy from the custom of the early monks whose duty called them to wake their brethren for the Night Office. This they did by intoning passages of Scripture appropriate to the day or season."²²

The Invitatory in Matins parallels the Antiphon in its use, and like the Antiphon it varies with the occasion. It should be noted that the various seasons of the Church Year and certain days have special Invitatories designated for use in those particular seasons or on the particular day. These are given in the *Lutheran Hymnal* on pages 95—101. In each one of these Invitatories we find both a call to worship and a characteristic fact of the particular season or day as the motive for such worship. As in the case of the anti-

phon, the Lutheran rubric leaves no option concerning the use of the Invitatory, but directs that the whole Invitatory be repeated after the Venite. It is preferable to have a single voice sing the whole Invitatory before the Venite, while after the Venite it should be sung responsively, the first part by a single voice, and the latter part by the whole choir or congregation.²³

The Venite

It has already been pointed out that the Invitatory and the Venite should be considered together, since they together form the call to worship. The Venite, which is the Latin for the first word of the Psalm, O come, is actually Psalm 95:1-7, the last four verses being omitted. It is distinctly an invitation and exhortation of believers to believers to join together in singing praises and thanksgiving to God.

The first use of the Venite in Matins is attributed to Pope Damasus (died 384). Its original use came about in this way. The monastic brothers began Matins with the Psalms, but invariably the brothers would arrive at the chapel after Matins had begun. It was first permitted, therefore, that one could be late up to the end of the second Psalm in the first Nocturne. Then the custom arose of chanting two Psalms before beginning the Nocturne, so that the brothers could all assemble in time before the beginning of Matins. The second of these two Psalms was Psalm 95 or the Venite as we know it.²⁴

The Office Hymn

The use of the Office Hymn is not optional as was the case with the opening hymn. The rubric directs that this hymn shall be sung. This is in complete accordance with the historical use of only one hymn in each Office. Its position at this point in Matins is of significance. Having received and accepted the invitation to worship the Lord in songs of praise, the worshiper now actually engages in a song or hymn of praise. This hymn virtually sets the keynote for the entire service and is usually a hymn of praise exclusively, although not necessarily. It should be in harmony with the rest of the service, such as the Psalmody, the Lection, and so forth. Since the rubrics do not direct that the hymn be one of the Office Hymns that were written and anciently used specifically for Matins, it seems

wholly permissible to use either one of the ancient Office Hymns or any other hymn suitable for an Office Hymn. However, every Office Hymn should include a doxology in the same meter and rhyme pattern as that of the Office Hymn.

The Psalmody

Throughout the centuries, ever since the Psalter was written, the faithful have used it in their services of praise. It may be expected therefore to find the use of Psalms in Matins. When the keynote of the day or the service has been given in the Office Hymn, the service quite naturally and smoothly flows ahead with the Psalmody. The Psalmody includes the Psalms proper and also their antiphons. The Psalmody as a whole is devotional, like hymnody, and therefore sacrificial in character, a corporate act of worship and prayer.

The Antiphon

The direction of the rubric is that an antiphon may be used with each Psalm. "The antiphon is a Psalm verse, or other sentence from Holy Scripture, recited or sung immediately before each Psalm, or each group of Psalms, and before the canticles, except the Te Deum."²⁵ An antiphon is used in the same way as the Invitatory. It may be sung by a single voice before the Psalm and is repeated after the Psalm by the entire choir or congregation. Its function or use today is primarily to give the key to the meaning of the respective Psalm, or Canticle, especially as it is related to the individual service, day, or season.

The rubrics governing the number of antiphons in relation to the number of Psalms used leave the number of antiphons optional. Therefore, according to circumstances one may use either one antiphon for each Psalm or one antiphon for all the Psalms. Ordinarily, "both common practice and the implication of the rubrics in the Matins and Vesper orders commend the use of an antiphon for each Psalm."²⁶

The Psalms

Two chief considerations in the use of Psalms in Matins are the number of Psalms to be used and the manner in which they are used. Medieval tradition dictates that there should be at least three used in each Matins service.²⁷ The use of the Gloria Patri at the

end of each Psalm (or at least at the end of the whole Psalmody) is a historic practice. It signifies that the Psalms which the believers of the Old Testament used, and which we use today, expressed their faith and belief, which faith and beliefs are identical with those which we confess in the New Testament era. Various tables suggesting the choice of Psalms for Matins may be found in the *Lutheran Hymnal*. According to tradition, the Psalms should be sung. If the Psalms are read or sung responsively, this should be done verse upon verse rather than half-verse upon half-verse. Musical settings of the Psalter are available to congregations desiring to use them. On Trinity Sunday the Athanasian Creed may replace one Psalm (or the whole Psalmody).

The Lection

The reading of a portion of Scripture has always been one of the most important parts in any service of worship. This is especially true in Matins, where the emphasis already in its early and ancient use was on the reading of the Word. On Sundays and festivals two lessons are read, one from the Epistles and one from the Gospels. Note should be taken of the difference between "lection" and "lesson." "Lection" describes the total number of lessons read from Scripture; "lesson" describes an individual portion of Scripture which is read, whether it be all or a part of the whole "lection." The rubrics direct the announcement of a lesson as a "lesson," not as a "lection." After the reading of the Word of God, the reader or officiant says, "But Thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us," and the congregation expresses its thanks in the response. The given versicle with its response is optional, but invariable. The response expresses our continual need for the mercy of God; it indicates and offers up to God our thankfulness for His holy Word, in which we receive His mercy. The first thought is our failure in living according to God's Word, and therefore our plea for mercy; but the second thought is that of thankfulness to God for His mercy, which again is given to us in His Word.

The Responsory

The Responsory is a variable part of Matins which was originally sung after each lesson. Today the best usage appears to chant the Responsory only after the last lesson. In chanting the Responsory,

one may "have the opening words of the responsory sung either by a cantor, or by the officiant, the choir or congregation joining in up to the verse. . . . The remainder is rendered by having the cantor or officiant sing the verse and the Gloria Patri, with the choir or congregation making the responses."²⁸ Two complete series of settings are available for the Responsories, one by Max Reger, and the second by J. F. Ohl.

The Sermon

This element of Matins is an addition of the sixteenth century. The ancient Order of Matins had no sermon or address whatsoever. Matins was a service primarily of praise and thanksgiving and prayer. Only with the Reformation emphasis on the preaching of the Word did the Sermon enter the Order of Matins. The rubric at this point is permissive and uses the adjective "brief" to describe the sermon or exhortation.

The Offerings

Again the rubric is here permissive due primarily to the fact that Matins are often conducted at times when no offerings are gathered. When, however, an offering is gathered, this is a fitting place in the service to do so. Upon hearing the Word of God either in the Lection or the Lection and the Sermon, the worshiper is anxious to use that which he has also in material goods to extend the Kingdom of God here in this world and to build up the *Ecclesia* of God.

The Canticle

Once again in the service the worshipers respond after having heard the Word of God in a joyous song of praise and thanksgiving, this time in a special type of song called a Canticle. Anciently there were seven of these, plus the Te Deum. Except the Te Deum, all were taken from the Old Testament and were sung to one of the Psalm tones. The Lutheran Hymnal, in addition to the four printed out in the orders for Matins and Vespers, gives nine canticles for use in worship, found on pages 120—122. For convenience they are listed here together with the source or sources on which they are based and the day on which they are traditionally used.

<i>Canticle</i>	<i>Day Used</i>	<i>Source</i>
Benedicite Omnia Opera (The Song of the Three Holy Children)	Sunday	The (Apocryphal) Song of the Three Holy Children, 35, 37-65 (Daniel 3, 57-87), a paraphrase of Psalm 148
Confitebor Tibi (Song of Isaiah)	Monday	Isaiah 12:1-6
Exultavit Cor Meum (Song of Hannah)	Wednesday	1 Sam. 2:1-4, 6-10
Cantemus Domino (Song of Miriam and Moses)	Thursday	Ex. 15:1, 2, 6, 11, 13, 17-18
Domine, Audivi (Song of Habakkuk)	Friday	Hab. 3:2-6, 13, 18-19
Audite, Coeli (Song of Moses)	Saturday	Deut. 32:1-4, 9, 36, 40, 43
Ego Dixi (Song of Hezekiah)	Tuesday	Isaiah 38:10-20
Beati Pauperes (The Beatitudes)		Matt. 5:3-12
Dignus Est Agnus		Rev. 5:12-13; 15:3-4; 19:5-6

The proper use of these Canticles is given in the rubrics of *The Lutheran Liturgy* on page 422. The two chief Canticles used in Matins are the Te Deum and the Benedictus, which are discussed below.

The Te Deum Laudamus

Undoubtedly this Canticle is one of the greatest songs of praise ever written. Its use in Matins at this point is, as it were, a grand climax to that part of Matins in which the faithful sing their gratitude and praise to God, including the various responses and the hymn. All are beautiful expressions of praise, but none are more eloquent than the Te Deum. The greater part of the Te Deum proper resembles a paraphrase on the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. Cast in the form of rhythmic prose (or of a hymn when sung), it is an exalted combination of praise and prayer. This is in complete harmony with the entire order of Matins. In fact, as such it is also a bridge between the former part of Matins, which is primarily praise, and the latter part, which is primarily prayer. The creedal confessions form the basis for the several universal petitions which follow. The first main section is similar to the Preface or Sanctus in *The Liturgy*. The second section commemorates Christ's redemptive work, as does the Creed, and on this basis proceeds with the petitions and supplications. The concluding section gives the Te Deum its character as a morning Canticle with its prayer for the

Lord "to keep us this day without sin." Neither the Gloria Patri nor any Antiphons are used with the Te Deum. The best usage dictates that the entire congregation join in singing the Te Deum in standing position.

The Benedictus

Originally this Canticle was a part of Lauds, but at the time of the Reformation it was incorporated into Matins. It is the Song of Zacharias, recorded in Luke 1:68-79. The form is Jewish, but the content is thoroughly Christian and universal. The entire Canticle is a hymn of praise to God for the incarnate Word of God. It reiterates the promises of God in the Old Testament concerning this Word and rejoices in the fulfillment of all these promises. The first section speaks of the hope of the Messiah, who will bring spiritual deliverance, to the end that the faithful might serve Him without fear. The latter part of the Canticle is addressed to the forerunner of this Messiah, who would precede the Messiah and herald His coming. The Gloria Patri is added to the Benedictus, which again symbolizes the unity of faith with believers of time past. This Canticle is usually used as an alternate to the Te Deum according to the rubrics.

The Prayers

The caption "The Prayers" here embraces the service from this point to the end of the service. In thankfulness and realizing their need the faithful offer up to the throne of grace their prayers of praise and petition, of thanksgiving and supplication. This whole latter part of Matins is variable. Instead of the form given in the Order of Matins in the *Lutheran Hymnal* the Canticle may according to the rubric be followed by the Suffrages, the Morning Suffrages, or the Litany.

The Kyrie

The first of the prayers used in Matins is the Kyrie, also called "the Lesser Litany." The name itself is the Greek form for "Lord." It is based upon such Biblical sources as Ps. 51:1; 123:3; Matt. 9:27; 15:22; 20:30; and Mark 10:47. The important element is the earnest cry of the faithful, not only for forgiveness of sins, but also for divine help and mercy in every need and distress. In reality

the Kyrie here serves as a prelude to the petitions of the Lord's Prayer and the other prayers which follow. The rubric implies that the Kyrie be said or sung together by all.

The Lord's Prayer

The Lord's Prayer at this point in Matins is most appropriate. It includes both praise and supplication. It expresses the personal needs of the individual as well as the universal needs of all men, and particularly the special requests of all the faithful.

The Salutation

The function of the Salutation is here not only that of a preface or introduction, but it is also, and much more so, a prayer that God will hear the joint petitions of the officiant and the congregation which the officiant offers up audibly for the entire congregation.

The Collect for the Day

The rubrics governing the Collect for the Day and all succeeding Collects in Matins are given in *The Lutheran Liturgy* on page 418. The first Collect used is usually the Collect for the Day. The use of the Collect for the Day in our Order of Matins relates our prayers to the particular Day or Season of The Church Year.

Special Collects

After the Collect for the Day additional collects may be said. Traditionally the number of such Collects used is five or less, due to the historic tradition that the total number of collects used should be an odd number and should not exceed seven.²⁹ The special collects may be in the form of memorials or *ad libitum* collects.

The Collect for Grace

The final collect used in Matins is the Collect for Grace, which is invariable. It is also listed at times as a Collect for Protection During the Day. A versicle may be used before this collect. In this case the versicle usually used is the following:

V: Let my mouth be filled with Thy praise.

R: And with Thy honor all the day.

The emphasis in the Collect for Grace on the desired help and guidance, direction, and protection is most fitting at the beginning

of the day. The versicle given above and the collect together form a proper conclusion to the entire service. The response of the congregation is "Amen," signifying that the prayer was the united prayer of all the assembled faithful.

The Benedicamus

This versicle is an invitation to the congregation once more to give thanks, while the response is a final giving of thanks by the congregation for all grace and mercy received.

The Benediction

This familiar New Testament Benediction, which should be used without variation, is a blessing, a sacramental act, imparted only when an ordained clergyman officiates. It is a fitting dismissal from the service, which the congregation acknowledges responding with "Amen." In giving this Benediction, according to the traditional form historically associated with all blessings, the right hand only is raised in blessing while the left hand is held flat against the breast. The Sign of the Cross is made at the words "Our Lord Jesus Christ." After the response to the Benediction by the congregation there should be a silent prayer by all before leaving the church or chapel.

III

The spirit of Matins is first of all a spirit of unity, a spiritual union of people with people. Matins is not to be just another form or ritual, but rather a living, vital expression of the faith of those who participate in this service and in this particular form of worship, which is corporate worship. The spirit of all corporate worship is the spirit of unity among all those who worship together in like manner, including, in Christian worship, all believers on earth as well as myriads of saints and legions of angels, multitudes of Prophets, Apostles, and martyrs of ages past and the faithful of the present. The realization of this will make one conscious that there are no boundaries or limitations when believers worship. Congregational barriers fall by the way, years and decades and centuries lose their limitations. When any group of believers joins together in worship, and in this connection does so using the form of Matins, that group does not worship alone as a single group, but rather it

worships together with the whole *Ecclesia* of God. This is vividly brought out in various expressions in the *Te Deum*.

Moreover, the spirit of Matins is the spirit of praise. The worshiper must never lose sight of the content or the spirit of Matins. From the beginning of Matins to its very end there is one spirit — the spirit of praise to God. Almost every sacrificial act of the worshiper in Matins is an additional act of praise, from the versicle to the hymn to the response to the Responsory to the Canticle — all build up to one grand climactic paean of praise.

The one primary purpose of Matins is to provide an opportunity for individual believers to join together in corporate communion with God, to praise Him for all His blessings, to praise Him for His grace and mercy, for establishing and preserving His *Ecclesia* on earth, for the blessings received through the Word, and to praise Him for the privilege of worshiping Him together with all the saints and angels. There should be no doubt about the fact that the Church in our day has not fully realized this purpose of Matins and does not use this form of worship to its fullest possibilities. Before the Church can accomplish any such ideal goal in respect to the use of Matins, instruction will have to be given concerning the necessity, importance, and value of having services additional to the chief service of the holy day. *Matins is not to take the place of the chief service on Sunday.* Matins is *supplementary* to the chief service. As such, however, it is difficult to conceive of a finer order of worship for the congregation, especially for early or daily services.

Matins is unusually adaptable with its variable parts and extremely flexible. It may be used in its simplicity or in rich liturgical and musical elaboration. No one can give a group of specific directions to a congregation or any other group as to how they should conduct the service in their midst. Each group must decide for itself. Only, however, when the congregation understands what Matins is, will it begin to appreciate this liturgy. When the congregation knows some of the history of Matins and understands its character and function, then it will be a service which the congregation will not only enjoy, but also one toward which they will eagerly look forward.

St. Louis, Mo., and Dallas, Tex.

FOOTNOTES

¹ 1 Dan. 6:10. "Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime."

² Acts 10:9.

³ Acts 3:1.

⁴ F. R. Webber, "Matins and Vespers," *Pro Ecclesia Lutherana*, II, (1934), 43.

⁵ *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton Company, c. 1907—12), X, 51.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Luther Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia: Muehlenberg Press, c. 1947), p. 364.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ R. M. Smith, "The Sources of the Minor Services," *Memoirs of the Lutheran Liturgical Association* (Pittsburgh: Lutheran Liturgical Association, c. 1906), II, 35.

¹⁰ Webber, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

¹¹ Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 364.

¹² F. E. Cooper, An explanation of the Common Service (6th revised edition; Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, c. 1941), p. 75 f.

¹³ Joseph Jungmann, *Liturgical Worship* (New York: Frederick Pustet Co., 1941), p. 75.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 75 f.

¹⁵ Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

¹⁶ Webber, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

¹⁷ Francis Proctor, *A History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892), p. 234.

¹⁸ E. T. Horn, "Luther on the Principles and Order of Christian Worship," *Lutheran Church Review*, X (July, 1891), 245 f.

¹⁹ Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 366.

²⁰ Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

²¹ Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 384 f.

²² Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 386.

²³ A. C. Piepkorn, "The Rubrics Governing the Use of the Minor Propers of Matins and Vespers," *American Lutheran*, XIX (September, 1936), 16. It should be noted that this article was written before the current edition of the *Lutheran Hymnal* was published.

²⁴ Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

²⁵ Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 371.

²⁶ Piepkorn, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

²⁹ Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 400.

The Grace of God Gives Us Christ for Justification

By GERHARD SCHULZE-KADELBACH

Kirchenrat Gerhard Schulze-Kadelbach, Dr. theol., is rector of the Thuringian Pastoral Seminary in Eisenach and of the Pastoral Conference of the Ev. Luth. Church in Thuringia. He is also lecturer on New Testament of the Theological faculty in Jena.

This essay was delivered by the author at the 1952 conferences sponsored by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod in Berlin. It is presented to the readers of this journal as an example of current theological thought in some parts of the Lutheran Church in Germany. Of special significance is the author's emphasis on the proclamation of the Gospel by word of mouth (*viva voce*) as the message of the Church, reminiscent of the Dorpat school of some years ago. Noteworthy, too, among other things, is his criticism of the third use of the Law. This essay was matched by one prepared by one of the American essayists. Both essays were then discussed by a smaller group and finally by the entire conference.

In rendering the essay into English Dr. L. W. Spitz has sought to retain the full flavor of the original by adhering to the German idiom as much as possible. The title originally was: *Die Gnade Gottes gibt uns Christum zur Rechtfertigung*. — ED.

OUR theme is a confessional statement. The statement as a whole as well as each of its terms makes sense only as a confession. We must consider this for a moment at the very outset. In doing so, our thoughts tend in two directions. The realization that we are dealing with a confessional statement implies above all that the assertion of our theme is possible only within the Church. The little word "us" points unmistakably to this fact: "The grace of God gives us Christ for justification." In unfolding the content of our statement, we are speaking of ourselves. For that reason it is not a theoretical, speculative conclusion, but a purely theological assertion. The confessing "I," the confessing "we," is an inseparable part of it. If it were missing, our statement could be misunderstood as a part of a religious world view, whose correctness or incorrectness would be debatable with reasons and counter-reasons. But because this "I," this "we," is there, it must be taken seriously as a confession of faith, and one can only search for its meaning and content.

Here, however, lurks a second danger. Our statement must not

be understood as an assertion of anthropology. Confession within the Church is not communication regarding one's own, either really or presumably self-fashioned, inner life, but is response to the proclaimed and received Word of God. Hence, in Luther's *Small Catechism*, "the Creed" follows upon God's address in the First Commandment. Because man has heard, "I am the Lord, thy God," he can, in turn, confess to God, "I believe that Thou art my Creator, my Redeemer, and my Holy Spirit." As a confession our theme is neither the questionable declaration of an irrelevant truth, nor is it the expression of a mere consciousness, but a witness to the deeds of God, regarding which both facts must be considered: They take place *extra nos*, but they take place *pro nobis*.

If we now turn to our theme after these preliminary remarks, to which we must return ever and again, it will become apparent that it does not express a condition, but a movement. This movement starts at the grace of God, leads to Christ, and from Him to our justification; but it does not stop there, but again leads back to the grace of God. Hence one is here viewing a circular movement.

This fact raises the question at which point we must take hold if we are to see clearly in the matter. Purely theoretically it would be possible to enter this closed circle at every one of its significant points. And yet it appears inadvisable to me to proceed, for instance, from the grace of God; because the danger of a theoretical construction can then hardly be avoided; the grace of God is not a principle that one could manipulate, not an axiom on which one could rely; but just as little might it be advisable to begin with justified man, because the danger of anthropologizing then threatens to become overwhelming. Therefore we begin with the reality to which our theme "gives us Christ" points, that is, with the confession of the Church regarding Christ.

I

What is its content? The theme certainly says Christ for a purpose. In spite of that, we must start with Jesus, that is, with the *Christ yesterday*. Luther indeed never tired of warning: "He that would ignore Christ's life and deeds and would now seek Him in his own way, as He sits in heaven, would again fail. He must seek

Him, as He was and walked on earth. There he will find the Life, there He came as Life, Light, and salvation for us. There everything occurred which we are to believe of Him." (*W.A.* 10, I, 1, 201.)

1. In doing so we must, of course, not think of the so-called historical Jesus. More radical than many historical-critical theologians, Martin Kähler showed exactly sixty years ago that the so-called historical Jesus is intangible for us. And today the verdict of the form-critical method, that we can grasp as original only the individual short paragraphs, the individual parable, indeed, the individual sentence, may be regarded as a generally accepted result of research. But also these tiny items, so transmitted, are already entirely engaged in the service of the message of faith for faith and make no claim of any kind to be parts of a biography. This, however, is doubly true of their editorial settings and construction.

It is understandable that historical interest will not be satisfied with this verdict and, accordingly, ever and again looks about for a secure basis in the face of criticism. Bultmann and Gogarten, one of his followers, believe that they can point to the message of Jesus in that sense. Regarding this one must say, however, that no agreement can be reached by the researchers with respect to what may be accepted as an indisputably true message of Jesus of Nazareth, and even less with respect to the order in which it is to be arranged: if, as Bultmann would have it, it belongs into Judaism (*Theol. Rundschau, Neue Folge* 1932, p. 9), or if, as Gogarten believes, it is to be viewed as something entirely new (*Verkündigung*, 145). Above all, it should be said, however, that what is gained in this manner as the message of Jesus does in no manner comprise even approximately, not to say, exhaust, what Christianity means when it mentions the name of Jesus Christ. When we, therefore, speak of Him in our context, we are not thinking of this *historical Jesus*, especially since for us the Crucified and Risen One, too, belongs to the *Jesus yesterday*. Certainly, also the historical view has something to say of the cross of Jesus. And today it says of it not only that it was the proof of an upright, brave, pious man in the face of what had become the inevitable issue of His life. But is what it says today basically much more? Jesus — thus we can, perhaps, paraphrase Gogarten's exposition of this — in His death

obediently takes the wrath of God upon Himself and precisely thereby remains in the love of God, or, expressed in the words of the philosophy underlying this: His death is a function of His life. And to recognize just that, so we may possibly hear there, means to believe in His resurrection. When we speak of the Crucified and Risen One, we do not mean such a dying and such a resurrection of Jesus. We do not mean—permit us, for the sake of brevity, the further use of Kähler's expression, in spite of all modern modifications of the problem—the so-called historical Jesus, because a so-called historical Jesus can always be only one who is subject to analogism and comprehensible on the basis of causality. But His cross and His resurrection are not for us such historical data of that world which is comprehensible to us. Certainly some things which necessarily pertain to them can be demonstrated as historically trustworthy. It can be shown that when Pontius Pilate was governor, a Jewish Rabbi was executed on the cross as a criminal, and surely it can be established historically as very probable that the grave of Jesus was empty on Easter morning. I would say that less in view of the Gospels than of the testimony of Paul, Rom. 6:3-4; 1 Cor. 15:3. But even if the execution of Jesus and the empty grave can be established historically, their mere factuality is still in no manner what Christianity means, when it speaks of the Crucified and Risen One. It does not, indeed, mean a judicial murder of a noble enthusiast, and it knows—and not first since Reimarus—that the empty grave could be explained altogether differently than by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. And hence, for the last time: When we speak of *Jesus yesterday*, we are not thinking of an in-some-manner-tangible historical Jesus.

2. But whom then? Perhaps I may once more reply with the formulation which Martin Kähler, mentioned above, has coined: "the historical-Biblical Christ." With that I mean, in the sense of Kähler, something that also Wilhelm Mundle recently again emphasized: the preached and believed Christ of the New Testament, or, in the words of the *Studiendokument* of the theological section of the plenary meeting of the Lutheran World Federation in Hanover: Jesus Christ as the living Word as the Holy Scripture presents Him to us.

a. Thus we are, on the one hand, really standing on historical ground. For the manifold and yet uniform testimony of earliest Christianity regarding its Lord Jesus Christ can well be attained with the means at our disposal. To mention but one unsuspect witness, I can here point to Martin Dibelius, who makes use of this fact in his sense when he evaluates "the Gospels as sources for the post-Easter, the Christian era" (*Jesus*, p. 80). Though this be granted, the Gospels do not lose their value for Christianity; on the contrary. For the same is said at the close of the Gospel according to John in the words of Scripture itself, where, as is well known, John says (20:31): "But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through His name."

b. Thus, however, already a second point has been added. The testimony regarding the historical-Biblical Christ not only puts us on the safe historical ground of the pristine Christian faith, but at the same time it gives us, wherever it is preached, heard, and believed, the *Jesus yesterday*. We do not, then, believe in Christ for the Bible's sake, but the faith in Christ, to which the hearer comes under the *viva vox evangelii*, brings him to faith in the Bible. Not that he would in this manner obtain historical knowledge illegitimately. But the Bible becomes for him the trustworthy witness to the Church-founding sermon. Martin Dibelius, speaking of this with a slightly derisive undertone, once said: "There are people to whom Jesus means so much, and the view of the cosmos propagated by natural science so little, that they see no problem here" (the signs and wonders of Jesus are meant) (*ibid.*, p. 70). No, the problems do not vanish, but, in spite of them, the believer becomes certain that God the Holy Spirit gives him trustworthy information regarding everything which he needs for his salvation; therefore he will ever again trustfully hear it. He thereby becomes certain of the *Jesus yesterday* in a much wider and deeper sense than would be possible in any conceivable historical way.

c. On this *Jesus yesterday* everything depends, everything that our theme implies, and thus all of salvation in time and eternity. Even if we do not know whether it happened in the year 30 or 33 or in another year near these two, only this is important, that it — let us for the present permit this indefinite expression — happened

on
ical
iest
ned
pect
of
for
be
on
ord-
wn,
eve
ye

The
us
at
be-
for
nes
Not
igit-
s to
this
ple
pa-
ere"
No,
ever
orthy
on;
mes
ense

hat
uity.
33
—
ned

on this earth, at a specific place, in a specific hour: ἐφάπαξ, as the Scripture says (Rom. 6:10 and again in Hebrews), something we today have every reason to recall. Pontius Pilate, who according to Josephus was procurator for ten years between the years 26 and 37, is mentioned in the Creed for a purpose. That of which we witness in the Church, in which we believe, and through which we live, is an event in history, a fact. And we look back to this fact, which occurred 2,000 years ago. Most certainly it was prepared in a pregnant history, extending through centuries, and most certainly it continues to work till the hour in which we are meeting here right now. But this fact itself is the turning point in time.

3. What happened? Well, according to the testimony of the Sacred Scripture, the simple faith of Christianity, and the confession of the Church, exactly that happened which today is called *mythos*: ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο, whereby subject and predicate are equally valid, to wit: the λόγος who was in the beginning and was with God and was God, He through whom all things were made; and σάρξ, truly flesh in His completely being surrendered to the world; γενέσθαι, truly "to become something," with the exclusion of all docetism, hence not merely in the sense of a change of attributes, like becoming fishers of men, Mark 1:17, becoming a traitor, Luke 6:16, but in the sense of a change of being, like, perhaps, the way stones become bread, Matt. 4:3. At any rate, the assertion speaks of the true God who became true man. He labored in Jesus Christ on this our earth, He was here rejected by men like us, and, forsaken of God, He died on the cross; Him God raised from the grave. One may say that these assertions are those of an obsolete world view and are incompatible with that prevailing now; one can say that these assertions have a meaning which we can only get through an existential interpretation, that is, one which seeks an understanding of the actual meaning, and that only what supposedly is meant in the Biblical manner of presentation is important; but whatever it may be, one must be aware of the fact that whenever one reduces the so-called *mythos* to significations, one loses neither more nor less than the *Jesus yesterday*, the historical-Biblical Christ, no matter how impressively and forcefully one may speak of the proclamation of Jesus Christ. If we subjectivize the objectivizing statements, we

no longer testify and can no longer testify what Holy Scripture testifies. For it really means what it says; it really means an event in space and time and an event which as such is in its oneness and actuality of fundamental and lasting importance.

4. It is indeed a matter of meaning or, if you please, of significance. We must not forget, however, that on the basis of the New Testament the Church has something to say regarding Christ's being: true God and true man. These assertions must not merely be understood as two different designations of the man Jesus; they do not merely designate a different manner in which Jesus "is ours" (Gogarten p. 367); they are not, to use the older term, value judgments, reached on the basis of the impression, which the life and labor, suffering and death, of Jesus of Nazareth, above all, also His proclamation, make on impressionable men, but they are meant as judgments of being, and only as such do they accomplish what they are to accomplish. Only if the man Jesus is not merely held to be God, evaluated as God, but is really God, entirely independent from any recognition or rejection which He receives, can He be a true help to us at all. For that reason Luther always emphasized again and again that one must begin with the humanity of Jesus, but dare not stop there. "One must begin at the bottom and thereupon come up . . . to a Lord over all creation, thereupon to a God" (W.A. 10, 12, 297). At the same time we fully realize how impossible it is to comprehend what these statements mean. We also purposely decline to repeat in any manner the attempts which indiscreetly and irreverently try to answer the unanswerable questions that here arise. To preserve the mystery of God's becoming man, we can only repeat the delimiting designations of the Chalcedonian Creed: ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως. We may, then, in the language of the history of dogma, use the en-hypostasy-Christology, which, after all, is based on the Prologue of the Gospel of John, and which Leontius of Byzantium inaugurated in further developing the doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria, and insert in it the Chalcedonian formula. (Cf. Brunstädts, *Theologie der Bekenntnisschriften*, p. 36ff.) If anyone deems it necessary, in this connection, to call attention to the fact that this means to make the assertions regarding Christ dependent on the result of the intrigues of the court camarilla of the 4th century, one may

simply answer that it makes no difference in which manner a doctrinal formulation of the Church has come about, but one need only ask whether it expresses the record of Scripture in a proper manner and guards it against false interpretations and human officiousness. And that is the case here. God the Holy Spirit uses also the mistakes and the wickedness of men to reach His goal. He cannot do otherwise; else He would have to forego the co-operation of men altogether. Hence we confess gratefully, reverently, and with complete confidence: God gives Jesus Christ, that is, He gives Himself, true God in the true man. And we mean that in the sense of Luther altogether as Person. So it is not a matter of a unity of deity and humanity, however it may be imagined, but of the One, who is God in Person and man in Person and as such becomes our Lord and God.

5. Now, that is indeed something unheard of. If we wish to view this somewhat more closely, we can do no better than to remember what the Confessions say of Christ's obedience. On the basis of the New Testament, they again and again speak of the obedience which Christ rendered to the Father as God and man even unto death and both in doing and in suffering, in life and in death, so that the work of the incarnate Son is simply obedience to God's Law, through which God is wrathful and kills (SD III 15, 55). Biblically, of course, Phil. 2, 5-11 is of prime importance. Though this passage may be variously interpreted and one may doubt whether here the reference is to the *λόγος ἀσαρχος*, so many today, or *ἔνσαρχος*, so Luther and at one time all Lutherans, but also Loofs and others: this uncertainty can apply only to the "made Himself of no reputation"; whereas the obedience, without contradiction, pertains to the earthly Jesus, and this obedience is, as expressly stated, an obedience unto death. As far as the Bible is concerned, however, death and sin, death on the tree and the curse of God, belong together (Gal. 3:13). The fact that Jesus Christ was born of a woman and put under the Law implies, at the same time, as also Luther emphasizes in his Large Commentary on Galatians (W.A. 40 I 499), that He was made sin and a curse. There is little value in distinguishing in this obedience between an *obedientia activa* and *passiva*, for Christ's obedience consists in His complete surrender, is unreserved deliverance to God and man.

The well-understood *theopaschite* formulation, to which Elert has again drawn attention (*Tb. L. Z.* 1950), is thus justified to the same extent as the choral: "O grosse Not, Gott selbst ist tot," or Luther: "He who kills Christ, has killed God's Son, God and the Lord of Glory Himself."

II

God became man. (Cf. Luther's sermon, 1525, on Phil. ch. 2 — *W. A.* 17 II 237ff.) If that occurred in the profound seriousness and the undiminished reality, to which the Church's doctrine, on the basis of the New Testament, tries to cling, it has an unprecedented reason.

1. One can develop a Christian anthropology from various angles and view the phenomenon of human lostness from various angles, but certainly from none so inevitably as that of the divine incarnation. The fact that God gave Christ reveals, as nothing else could, that man on his part does not possess the slightest ability to save himself. If man had been able to do that in any possible manner, God would never have suffered the sacrifice of His only-begotten Son. There is no more powerful, impressive, convicting sermon of repentance than this truly staggering fact. In this sense Luther is able, ever and again, not only to denote the proclamation of the suffering and death of Jesus as preaching of the Law, but also to portray it in its terrifying effect as Law. In delivering up His Son, God, therefore, applies Law to uncover man's sin and to reveal His wrath over sin and the sinner.

2. But even as God in delivering up His Son causes the Law to become effective, He at the same time also causes His complete love to become effective. For when God gives His Son, the Law at the same time attains its *téλος* in the double sense of end and fulfillment, of conclusion and goal, and this conquest of the Law by Him is the Gospel, "pure grace and mercy, shed upon us and spread over us in Christ." Christ's work of judgment is *opus alienum*; His *opus proprium* is justification. God gives us Christ for His justification. All of this merely describes what Paul sums up in that pregnant declaration: "(God) hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. 5:21). Thus we have reached the very heart of our entire problem and the decisive point of our

study: the doctrine of justification is rooted in Christology; indeed, it is only its other side, the side turned toward mankind. The *simul iustus, simul peccator* is only a special case of the "true God and true man." The fact that these belong together is conceded today by many, but often (Bultmann) in a manner which is just the opposite of our own. For some deduct Christology from the doctrine of justification and then make the two terms synonymous. But after the tardy recognition that not only Luther's doctrine of Holy Communion, but also that of the Trinity must be understood from the viewpoint of his Christology, Maurer recently (1950) showed emphatically in a larger way that also Luther's doctrine of justification is based entirely on his Christology, newly recovered from the ancient Church (Cf. Kinder *ELKZ* 1952, 2). This must be firmly kept in view. For if that is not done, Christology becomes a religious-philosophical speculation, and the doctrine of justification glides off into a religious-existential philosophy. But if both, Christology and the doctrine of justification, are understood in a clear and solid relationship to each other, they are qualified, jointly to express fully the entire content of the Christian *kerygma*. To illustrate this, one can point to the exchange between Christ and His own, which Luther often likes to mention: Christ gives to His own His entire salvation and all His goods and receives from His own their entire human sinfulness (for example, *Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* 12). Because Christ is true God and true man — indeed, in Himself, but not only in Himself, but at the same time for us — therefore we can be *simul iusti, simul peccatores*. God made Christ to be sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.

b. We know that Luther's translation "die vor Gott gilt" is already Reformation exegesis. The Greek, as is well known, has only δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. But Luther's translation is nevertheless correct. For, as a matter of fact, the point is that God, beyond all understanding, permits the sinner to exist before Him, indeed not because God recognizes any one of his works, but because He approves of him wholly as a person (*AS C, XIII*, 2). To the sinner, who can make no demands on Him, God imputes righteousness and thus makes it man's own. God's justifying judgment, as God's justifying judgment, is never merely judgment, but embodies reality.

c. Since God deals with the sinner in justification, the sinner obtains the righteousness before God in this that God forgives him his sin, does not impute it unto him, and therewith gives him full salvation, for where there is forgiveness of sin, there is also life and salvation (*C. A.* IV, 1; *Ap.* IV, 76). By virtue of the justification realized through the forgiveness of sin, this applies to us, "that we have a God, that is, that God is concerned about us" (*Ap.* IV, 141, 143; *Lat.*); "have a Father in heaven, who sees also us at all times . . . who is to be feared, loved, and whom we should sincerely thank . . . who hears our prayer, also our desiring and sighing." (*German.*) In brief, we belong to God altogether and please Him.

d. All of this applies, in the first place, personally to the individual Christian, whom the Word of justification addresses and who believes it. But it must not be restricted in any manner and misunderstood individualistically. Luther clearly showed that when, in the *Large Catechism*, in the explanation of the Second Article, he not only says that Christ did enough and paid for me, but at once explains that He brought back His own out of the realm of the devil to be under the rule of the Father (II, 28ff.). Justification is therefore a deed of God, which is done indeed just for me, but it is at the same time an entering into the Kingdom of Christ as a member, an incorporation in His body.

e. There has been a difference of opinion whether justification has a beginning and a continuation, whether there is in it a growing and a status. The Confessions are manifestly not particularly interested in these questions. They are eager that every person should repent and receive forgiveness. For for them there is justification always only *in actu* and not as *habitus*. For no man ever is justified otherwise than as *homo simul iustus, simul peccator*. The gift of justification is certainly at once an "already" and still a "not yet." "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be" (1 John 3:2). "For we are saved by hope" (τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν) (Rom. 8:24). Thus the gift of justification is actually received, but it attains its goal only in the perfection of eternity, when and where there will be neither Law nor Gospel any more. In this sense justification is a truly eschatological fact of the first order (*Gr. Kat.* II, 58); and justification remains

most intimately bound, as the most important content of a *theologia viatorum*, with the situation that is set forth in the two words "Law and Gospel," or, in other words: it views man in his inescapable guilt and acknowledges him in his imputed righteousness.

3. Thus we have once again come face to face with the question of Law and Gospel, which after a long time is today again receiving much consideration, and we must here briefly give it our attention.

a. We are not interested in it as a metaphysical, sociological, or psychological problem, but our interest centers in its kerygmatic implication. The correct understanding of the very involved relationship between Law and Gospel as the two Words of God has, in the main, the simple purpose of safeguarding the *solus Christus, sola fide*, and thereby preserving consolation for frightened consciences. God gives us Christ for justification, Him, Him only, and hence not the Law. This cannot be overemphasized. For this decides whether we are teaching Reformationally or in some manner "enthusiastically" (*schwärmerisch*). The Law is not given us for justification. And thus every dependence on the activity of culture as a proof for God's relationship naturally disappears, but also all confidence in a cultus which supposedly pleases God, all reliance on churchly tradition, and therewith also on one's own Confession. As valuable and important as our Confession may be—I call to remembrance the well-known word of Nathan Söderblom that he thanked God daily for letting him be born a Lutheran—nevertheless, no one is justified for the reason that he is a Lutheran. The Law is not given us for justification, that is, there is no possibility for man to stand before God by virtue of any kind of performance. Nothing in the world which may in any way be at his command can shield him against God.

b. The Law has its own entirely different and sharply defined purpose. God imposed it upon men because of sin. Accordingly, God keeps men's lives in an external bearable order through the Law in the *usus civilis seu politicus*, and with the *usus theologicus seu elenchiticus* He brings man to a knowledge of his sin and lostness. No matter, however, where and how man may ever perceive the Law, he always hears its "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not" as one who has need of this "Thou shalt," "Thou shalt not," hence

always as a transgressor of the Law, and therefore before God he can never find comfort in his morality. *Lex semper accusat* (*Ap. IV*, 38).

There can be no *tertius usus*, in which the Law functions as man's friendly, instructing guide. Luther did not teach it. The *Formula of Concord* neutralized Melanchthon's teaching regarding the third use of the Law. For it the difference between the second and the third use did not depend on the function of the Law, but only on the scope of its jurisdiction. In the second *usus* it strikes the still unregenerated with its sin-reproving effect; in the third *usus* the already regenerated. But since regenerated and unregenerated do not constitute two groups of men, but we recognize, with Luther, only the one man, who is *simul iustus, simul peccator*, the difference between the second and the third use of the Law, still maintained by the *Formula of Concord*, vanishes. To the question asked by the terrified man who craves assurance: "What shall I do to inherit life?" there is only one answer: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

c. But therewith the question regarding Law and Gospel as it pertains to our subject is not yet fully answered. It must be added that precisely because God gives us Christ for justification, the Law is confirmed. The Law, which claims the whole man for God, is God's eternal, holy, immutable will; it has the right to accuse self-seeking, self-justifying man (*Ap. IV*, 179). Jesus Christ does not abolish, but fulfills it. God gives Christ in order that that may happen which is the content of the Law; and in this manner God fulfills His eschatological promise, *Jer. 31:31*, of the new covenant (*Ap. IV*, 123, ff.). Thus the Law is confirmed through Christ, and, at the same time, loses its power through Him. Law and Gospel are the two fundamentally different Words of God with which He affects men. A transcendent unity of the two cannot be perceived by us. Only this may be said, that of these two Words, which are both thoroughly God's Words, the Law, with its accusing and convicting effect, is in the service of the Gospel as the παιδαγωγός εἰς Χριστόν, as the necessary παιδαγωγός, but as the παιδαγωγός εἰς Χριστόν. God gives us Christ, *Christum solum*, for justification.

d. Whoever believes that he can exchange Christ for anything else — and that could certainly only be the Law in some form —

not only misunderstands the Law as a means of salvation, but scorns and despises Christ and buries Him anew. (*Ap.* IV, 81; *C. A.* XXIV, 24.) The people who do not know what grace and faith are *obscurant gloriam et beneficia Christi* (*Ap.* IV, 3). And work-righteousness is a "horrible blasphemy" (*Ap.* XX, 4).

4. The total exclusiveness of the gift of God in Christ extends also to man's receiving it. Really Christ alone is our justification and not, for instance, also our faith. We can merely sketch in brief propositions the role that faith plays.

a. In the first place, it is certain that faith does not merely apprehend the Word (*Ap.* IV, 48), but comes through the Word: ἀρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς (Rom. 10:17; *Ap.* IV, 74). Faith is always secondary, never primary. Thus it is bound to an historical element, the testimony of the Church, in which the Word of God's promise in Christ encounters man. Faith, however, is not thereby a judging of the Word by man; but man believes as he with his whole being lets himself be planted upon this Word. This warrants the relative correctness of the currently emphasized identification of faith with obedience, which in the manner in which it is being presented, is not in accord with the New Testament, (Bultmann, *Urchristentum*, S. 256 Anm. 25). The Confessions, furthermore, emphasize that faith always exists only in actual subduing of the temptation which would cause the Christian to doubt God's promise and to reach for human assurances (*Ap.* IV, 20. 36. 142). Faith is therefore never situation, but always event. It overcomes temptation, as it, in hearing the Word of the Gospel, ever again learns to recognize in temptation the good and gracious dealing of God with men.

b. This faith the Confessions often call justifying faith. This wording appears as though faith created, effected, or even merited justification. But that is not at all the intention of the Reformers. To them it is much rather "the certain trust in the heart, when with my whole heart I regard the promises of God as certain and true," "not my doing, not my presenting or giving, not my work or preparation" (*Ap.* IV, 48), but altogether a receiving (*Ap.* II, 56). And it is the Holy Spirit who creates it (Rom. 15:13; Phil. 1:29: "For unto you it is given (ἐχαρίσθη) to believe" (*C. A.* V, 2; *Ap.* IV, 99). That this faith is then "a live, creative, active, mighty

thing" toward the neighbor, is closely connected herewith and does not contradict our conclusion. With respect to God faith is pure receiving, and hence the Confessions usually also say, whenever they speak of the significance of faith for justification, that man is justified *per fidem*.

c. Certainly they can also, at times, use the formula *propter fidem* (*Ap. IV*, 177. 189); Luther, too, does that occasionally. But that is possible only because Christ and faith belong together most intimately and can therefore also sometimes be exchanged for each other (*W.A.*, 10 II, 449ff.). For *fides*, indeed, is not merely regarded as *fides qua creditur*, but at the same time also as *fides quae creditur* (*Ep. V*, 5). Faith is certainly not a faith *in genere*, that is, a faith which believes in general that there is a God, etc. (*Ap. XII*, 60), but always an existential being struck by the "for me"; it is also not a mere historical faith, that Christ is born, suffered, etc., but in it the whole heart embraces this great treasure (*Ap. IV*, 48); faith, on the other hand, is, however, also not mere emotion on the part of man, but always, at the same time, a reality of definite content. From this point of view the *propter fidem* must be understood. We can rightly say: Faith is justification itself, and that because it receives all that God gives in Christ. Therewith it gives God the honor due Him and which He demands. Luther expresses this thought more methodically when he says that faith is justification for the very reason that, in purely receiving the gift of God in Christ, it fulfills the Law, which, in reality desires no more than that man should recognize God in His deity (e.g., 4. *Disputation gegen die Antinomier, Theses 33—36*).

III

Thus we have arrived at that point of our discussion where the basic assertion of our theme automatically comes to a focus.

1. If God gives us sinners Christ, His only-begotten Son, for justification, then this giving is grace. The term *χάρις* indeed embraces a wealth of associations in the New Testament; but following the Reformers, we no doubt seize upon the deciding point if we take *χάρις* as *favor dei*, God's favor, freely granted to the sinner, and, in so doing, do not conceive of it as an enduring sentiment, but as an act of salvation.

2. If God's giving is understood in this sense, then something is thereby said of man as well as of God. With regard to man, God's gift is designated as something altogether undeserved, in view of the term "grace." Man has no claim to this gift. If man confesses Christ as this gift of God, for his justification, then he surrenders himself fully, renounces every self-justification, recognizes himself as totally lost in evil and good days, in his entire being.

In this sense it can be said that grace contains Law (Elert, *Ethos*, p. 370). It is the gift, which leads to repentance exactly as undeserved favor. Only he receives this gift who has become conscious of his lostness. But it is and remains completely a gift. For only if he finds himself completely helpless is man as God would have him. To live by grace, i. e., to give God the honor, means to believe and thus really to be justified.

3a. God's gift in Christ is, however, grace also with regard to God. One certainly cannot distinguish that from the previous in fact, but only in expression. But this distinction in expression is important. If God gives Christ, He would help mankind. Then He in mercy takes the initiative. Then He would win man for Himself. Here is where John 3:16 comes in. God's love stands at the head of His dealing with humanity. Paul says the same, 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself," and it is man who is told: "Be ye reconciled to God." In this sense also Luther can say: "Christ does nothing else than to make the Father sweet for us and to bring us through Himself to the Father" (*W. A.* 10, III, 161).

b. As unambiguous and important as this is, not everything would be said that here must be said if one were to ignore the other side. It would imply the falsification of the Biblical testimony if one were to pretend that also God was not being reconciled. This is the only approach of the Confessions (*Ap.* IV, 80). Christ is to them a mediator and reconciler, a treasure, a price paid for our sins (IV, 57), the *hostia non tantum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis* (*C. A.* III, 3 etc.; *C. A.* IV, 2; *Gr. Kat.* 2, 31; *Ap.* IV, 179; XXIV, 56). Though man is indeed to gain confidence in God's goodness and is indeed to give up the fear of God's wrath, it is just as certain that the wrath of God is not the figment of the imagination of man. By

the fact that God gives Christ for justification, man is not to be disabused of an error, to which he had been subject with regard to the essence and the sentiment of God, but he is to become certain that God Himself has assumed a new attitude toward him, that God no longer treats him as a transgressor of the Law, but has very really given up His very real wrath toward him as the Father of Jesus Christ *propter Christum* or also *in Christo*, whereas His wrath remains (*μένει*) on him who does not believe in the Son (Joh. 3:36). The Biblical testimony regarding this is clear (Rom. 5:9-11; 1 Thess. 1:10; Rom. 3:25; 1 John 2:2; 4:10). Of course, the New Testament does not have a fully developed theory regarding the reasons for which and the manner in which the work of Christ influences God. It is, moreover, of little value to construct such a theory on the basis of the various expressions which the New Testament uses regarding this, such as sacrifice, ransom, and others. The assurance that God, for Christ's sake, approaches the sinner in a new manner must and can suffice us. It would be entirely wrong to describe this understanding of the grace of God, which in the overcoming of His wrath through Christ is grace, as a rationalization of the divine relationship. For what takes place within God still remains a complete mystery. Only the Biblical testimony is presented, and man receives no kind of guarantee for his faith, but must rely only on the testimony of that God who as the Father of Jesus Christ transforms His wrath into grace. *Propter Christum* and *in Christo*: it is well and noteworthy that both formulations occur. They are one and mutually explain each other: the *propter Christum* guards the *in Christo* against mystical misunderstanding, and the *in Christo* prevents the rationalization of the *propter Christum*.

IV

The grace of God gives us Christ for justification. We still have to consider, in conclusion, that the little word "gives" is in the present tense. We have spoken at length of the *Christ yesterday*. Neither is anything to be retracted. But we must still briefly give our attention to the *Christ today*. There certainly can be no dying and rising again with Christ if He did not at one time die and rise for us; no one can receive Christ for justification if God's grace did not at one time give Him into this world and if He did not

die on the cross and was not resurrected from the grave. But this "at one time," this "yesterday" and "there," becomes real and effective for me ever again today and here, only because and as God gives me Christ personally. He does it in having the Word with Christ as its content proclaimed to me in the Church and in having the Sacrament given me in which Christ is bodily present and so received. Thus it is true; thus it is something wholly different from a mere speculation; thus it ever again becomes a glad, grateful, prayerful confession in the Church:

The grace of God gives us Christ for justification.

Glossary of Abbreviations

Ap.	— Apology of the Augsburg Confession
AS C	— Smalcald Articles, Part III
C. A.	— Augsburg Confession
Ep.	— Formula of Concord, Epitome
Gr. Kat.	— Large Catechism
S. D.	— Formula of Concord, Solida Declaratio

HOMILETICS

Outlines on Synodical Conference Gospels

REMINISCERE

JOHN 15:18-25

To be willing to suffer for the sake of convictions is one mark of strength of character. Daniel 3; Acts 4:19; Heb. 11:25. A distortion of the quality of being willing to suffer for the sake of convictions occurs when the suffering is endured for misguided or worthless convictions or when the suffering is endured not for conviction's sake, but for martyrdom's sake.

Every Christian is a martyr in the sense that in seeking the good of the world he is misunderstood, maligned, and persecuted. The ill will he encounters from the world is not always of equal vehemence nor of one kind, but it always occurs. Consequently a Christian is always faced with the problem of responding to ill will as he encounters it from the world.

The central thought of the text is: Every Christian may expect to encounter ill will and hostility from the world, even as his Lord did, since he calls Jesus Lord and follows Him in ways that show he is not of the world.

RESPONDING TO ILL WILL

I. We can respond to ill will with understanding.

- A. We know why ill will comes, whether it be veiled or open, subtle or violent, v. 19.
 1. Ill will comes to Christians from the "world" (in distinction to "one another," v. 17) because people do not see God as He is, v. 21b. Knowing this helps us endure, James 5:10.
 2. Ill will comes because Christians show men their sin, vv. 19, 20; cf. John 3:19-21.
 3. Ill will may become violent. Cf. ch. 16:2. It ought not be unlooked for, therefore it ought not overwhelm us. Matt. 10:21, 22.

B. We are to take ill will calmly and serenely. Cf. Matt. 5:11.

1. Jesus tells us it will come, v. 20.
2. Witness what happened to Him, v. 18.
3. In the measure that we recall and portray Christ to those of the world, we shall be persecuted, v. 20.

C. Beware if the world loves you, v. 19a.

1. Popularity with the world is the kiss of death for a Christian; yet do not seek its ill will, v. 19.
2. Love by the world for you indicates a need for repentance, 2 Cor. 6:14; Amos 3:3.
3. Our lives must be a testimony against sin; yet they must give no just cause for hatred. Cf. pride, self-righteousness, callousness. 1 John 2:15, 16; 1 Peter 2:19-25.
4. The world reacted to Christ and the Father with hatred without cause, vv. 24, 25.

II. We can respond to ill will with constructive action.

A. Remember that ill will comes to us for Jesus' sake, v. 21.

1. Take comfort in your Savior, who endured much for you. Because He suffered much for our sakes, we are forgiven. Rom. 8:17; 1 Peter 3:17, 18.
2. His response to ill will sets the pattern also for our response, 1 Peter 2:23; 1 Cor. 4:12, 13.
3. Encountering ill will can draw you closer to your Savior. Such tribulation will serve to strengthen you, 1 Peter 4:1 and 12-16.

B. Respond to ill will with forgiveness, vv. 20, 25. Cf. Jesus' example.

1. The Christian never returns evil for evil but rather blessing for evil, 1 Peter 3:8, 9.
2. The object in forgiving is not self-gratification or self-imposed martyrdom, but the expressing of God's love in an intelligible way to testify and to reclaim, Luke 17:3, 4.
3. Having been forgiven much, we cannot but forgive, Col. 3:12, 13.

C. Respond to ill will with love, v. 20. Cf. Jesus' example.

1. God loved you even when you showed ill will toward Him, Eph. 2:4, 5.
2. Let love be the motive in your deeds of kindness and help in the face of ill will, 1 Cor. 13:3.
3. Warning, testimony, pleading, kindness—all must follow from the response awakened in your heart by the love God has shown to you, Acts 5:27-41.

Conclusion:

The Christian responds to the ill will and persecution of the world with steadfastness because he understands its necessity and with forgiveness and love because God has, in like circumstances, shown love to Him.

Portland, Oreg.

OMAR STUENKEL

OCULI

MARK 10:35-45

The problem of the human heart is the supreme problem of mankind. Physicians can heal many wounds and are able to control many diseases. On the civic level it is possible to "clean up" the government. Nations can to some extent abolish injustice and wrong.

Who, however, can control man's heart? It is the source of all human ills. "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. 8:21).

THE MASTER OF OUR HEARTS

I. *We are not the masters of our hearts*, vv. 35-41.

- A. James and John were leading disciples. They are mentioned after Peter and Andrew in the enumeration, Matt. 10:2. John is the disciple whom Jesus loved and is noted for humility and gentleness, John 19:26.
- B. Yet even these great and holy men are typical of all of mankind. Their hearts, like ours, were full of wild, strange, and evil emotions.
- C. James and John came to Jesus with their *own desire*, v. 35. Their desire and request was:

1. Foolish and proud, vv. 36, 37. This was just before Christ's Passion, and they were thinking of themselves.
2. Thoughtless, vv. 38-40. They did not realize what they were saying. The request was entirely out of place. God alone can decide such matters.

D. Yet the hearts of the other disciples were just as evil. The ten were too ready to criticize their brethren, v. 41. No human being is the real master of his heart. We are all weak and confused.

So is the human heart, even in the best of men! The hearts of all are by nature confused, weak, and misdirected. "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (Jer. 10:23).

We have all sinned. There are foolish and evil thoughts in all hearts. Some of the evil in our hearts can be outwardly suppressed. Much of this evil finally issues in sinful talk and words.

II. Jesus Christ, the Redeemer, alone can rule our hearts,
vv. 42—45.

- A. Jesus is the Redeemer, the Ransom, v. 45. He paid the full penalty on the cross for these sins of the heart and for all sins (John 1:29).
- B. Jesus is Master and Lord. He alone can give us the true values for living. He called the disciples together, v. 42. He alone could save them from themselves, from Satan, and from all evil. He alone could calm their wild emotions and set their hearts aright.
- C. Jesus is the Almighty Lord. He alone can give the necessary grace and strength to think and live rightly. His Word strengthens us so that we can follow His example, vv. 43, 44. "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:4, 5).

If the world my heart entices,
On the broad and easy road
With its mirth and luring vices,
Let me think upon the load

Thou didst carry and endure,
That I flee all thoughts impure,
Banishing each wild emotion,
Calm and blest in my devotion.

(Hymn 144: v. 3)

There is only one answer to the evil which always confronts us and presses in upon our inmost life, our heart: Jesus is the Savior, who forgives, and the Lord, who leads and strengthens us. He alone is the Master of our hearts.

Most people see only a part of life. They consider only the outward aspects—work and play, politics and government, etc. But it is the inner life of the individual which is most important. How about your heart? There is only one answer to man's greatest question. There is only one solution to his greatest need. Jesus Christ, the Savior of our souls, is the only Master of our hearts!

Chicago, Ill.

JAMES G. MANZ

LAETARE

JOHN 17:1-16

A great moment, as the monitor ticks off the seconds. Observers, technicians, tense for the great moment—the release of atomic energy. *A greater moment* when God said, "Let there be." This is the *greatest moment*—the Son of God to release *Himself* (explain). The energy effecting salvation. Most stupendous, momentous hour, "Father, the hour is come."

THE GREAT MOMENT

I. For Him

II. For them

It is His hour, we are spectators. Salvation entirely in the hands of God. The *moment* of sacrifice to commence, v. 1. His glory: He who is holy is made unholy by assuming unholiness—sin. Final phases of saving man rushing to completion. Though inglorious, love glorifies Him. The Son glorifies the Father, 1b. His glory is holiness, justice over sin. His glory, love, *now* revealed by sacrifice. *God's great moment.*

The *moment* further explained, v. 2. Fate of all men hangs on

Him. God's omnipotence and grace meet here. *This moment* — into the hands of His Son.

For what purpose? Give "eternal life," vv. 2b, 3. The *great moment* for man, know Christ, know God. Ch. 1:18; 14:6. *Every moment a great moment* for a Christian, knows God. Summary of His work, vv. 6, 7. "Now."

In retrospect, finished the purpose for which He had come. Let there be progress which *moment* demands, also in God's kingdom. Appl. Christ was prompt, punctual, in time with God, v. 4, "finished." We are never through, can never be satisfied with ourselves by ourselves. This *moment* never comes, except in Christ. Never up to the minute and moment. Sinners!

"Now." V. 5. Let us to the business, anxious to consummate. Good Friday, a glorification, leading to victory.

As of the *moment*, His ministry complete, v. 8, in the disciples, Expression of faith in ch. 16:30, the reward and goal of His ministry. The assurance needed that He could NOW proceed. The HOUR come, in which He would do them the greatest service, for them to see, though at the *moment* to their great horror. Appl.

Therefore He offers the prayer for them in their hearing, v. 9.

II

This is the hour for Him, it is also the hour for them, v. 10. How much He loved, trusted His disciples! "Mine." Weak, bungling, and inglorious, yet He was glorified in them. Why? They believed, "Thou art the Christ. . . ." Ch. 16:30. We also belong. Great mistakes of unbelief from *this hour* on. *Their hour* had come, not the glory road. They needed to be prayed for.

By anticipation, His work complete. By anticipation He is concerned for them, v. 11. The things that have kept them, also the things that will keep them, v. 12.

It was His *great moment*, but their *great moment* concerned Him, too. One look at Peter NOW, LATER, "O Father, keep them."

A *great moment* for you, when you have denied, slacked, slipped, and slogged. Sever yourself from name of God. In *that moment* Christ is praying. A *great moment*, in a double way. In dreadful hours He would keep us happy in the faith, v. 13; ch. 16:30.

The same word and name of God that unites them with God also

separates them from the world, v. 14. "I have given . . ." the consequences would follow. The WORD separates. When? In *what moment* are you separate? What separates you? Anything at all? Their hour for leaving has not yet come, vv. 15, 16. Many great moments yet to live. Between the *last moment* and now lies many a sermon, class, sickbed, etc. Appl.

To make *every moment* a *great moment*, remember the statement, "They are not of the world." Too often the *greatest moment* we think is to be a man of this world. How *many moments* so fretted and frittered away. For all *wasted moments* He wasted none.

The *greatest moment*? When Christ said, "The hour is come." God's *greatest hour*, greater than creation — salvation. His hour — for us. "It is finished," the wasted moments of millions, canceled in a moment. *That moment* fast approaching. For the Son of God — for Us.

Schaumburg, Ill.

F. A. HERTWIG, JR.

JUDICA

MATTHEW 23:34-39

The Introit with its initial cry: "Judge me, O God!" Whether expressed or not, it is the cry of all the living. The self-righteous so cry as a matter of pride in being able to stand on self because of merit. The sinner so cries in despair at the knowledge of certain doom because of sin. The careless so cry in their flippancy as they would have God judge however He will, it cannot greatly affect them. Faith so cries but only from under the wing of Christ's mercy whither is has been gathered by the call of His grace.

CHRIST'S CALL SPURNED IS JUDGMENT

I. Christ calls through the preachers He sends.

1. It should be noted that with the preached Word Christ is sending His various messengers to this day.
2. It should be noted that He sends them in love to call people from their sins to trust in Him.
3. They who refuse to hear them spurn Christ's offered love and are serpents and a brood of vipers, following in the footsteps of their father, the devil, the archserpent, whose brood they are.

II. Christ judges by taking His preached Word away.

1. Turning a deaf ear is the modern counterpart of the killing and crucifying and scourging and persecuting.
2. It is solely man's doing and therefore his personal responsibility.
3. It in itself is Christ's judgment because the very doing of these things is the filling of the cup of wrath. What men *will* not have, they *cannot* have.
4. They involve themselves in the guilt of all rejection from the beginning of the world because they refuse to learn from it and pride themselves besides on the fact that they would not do what they are doing in very deed (cf. vv. 29, 30).

III. Christ lamenting the lost means that Christ would still have the lost to be saved.

1. Whatever you have been or done (v. 37), Christ loves you still, as the simple and even tearful repetition, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," clearly shows.
2. He wants you in order that He might save you from the fate which you are preparing for yourself. Under His wing, whatever the judgment, it will not strike you. Here it should be shown that being under His wing is trusting in Him; the full judgment of God's wrath actually did strike, but it struck Him under whose shelter you are by faith; and while it killed the hen, the gathered brood escaped. Here the full appeal of grace, the Cross, its bloody suffering and protective, vicarious death.
3. Reject His offered love, and your house will be left to you desolate, as desolate as Calvary and as waste as hell.
4. Accept His offered love by blessing Him as having come in the name of the Lord, and you will see Him again as He comes to gather His own unto Himself forever, when every tongue shall confess as every knee bows: Jesus is the Christ, the Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Minneapolis, Minn.

WILLIAM A. BUEGE

PALM SUNDAY

JOHN 12:1-11

Contrast the Hosannas of the first Palm Sunday with the "Crucify Him" of the first Good Friday. How may we avoid following in those footsteps of fickleness and disloyalty? By placing ourselves

AT THE FEET OF JESUS

I. *What does it mean to be at the feet of Jesus?*

From a study of the various people in our text we learn that to be at the feet of Jesus means

A. That we honor Jesus as did Lazarus, who had been blessed by Jesus, v. 1. Lazarus had learned to know that Jesus is the Resurrection and the Life. By his presence at the table with Jesus, Lazarus confessed that Jesus is his Lord, who had blessed him. Also Lazarus honored Jesus by influencing many to believe on Jesus, v. 11.

Like Lazarus, we have been blessed by Jesus in the same manner. With Lazarus we know Jesus as the Resurrection and the Life. With Lazarus let us honor Jesus by being in the company of Jesus' friends — in church services, in church meetings, in the company we keep — thereby confessing Him as our Lord and King.

B. That we serve Jesus as did Martha and those who gave the supper in Bethany. It was an act of love and gratitude. They put their possessions, abilities, and time into the service of the Lord.

All those today who serve Jesus in the work of the Church — missions, teaching program, administration — join Martha at the feet of Jesus.

C. Above all, that we worship Jesus as our crucified Redeemer, as did Mary. Mary surpassed Martha and the others in dedicating her possessions to Jesus. She surpassed Lazarus in honoring Jesus, for her act of anointing the feet of Jesus and wiping His feet with her hair was one of complete consecration to Jesus.

Above all, she acted because she had understood what Jesus had said about His suffering and death. Of her act Jesus could say, vv. 7, 8.

When we with Mary worship Jesus as our Crucified Redeemer and see in His death and burial the price of our redemption, then with Mary we are at the feet of Jesus.

II. Whom will we find at the feet of Jesus?

A. Evidently we shall not find people like the chief priests, who sought to kill Lazarus, who in their ungodliness would do anything to maintain their earthly positions of power and honor.

Likewise today all those who value material wealth and power and position more than all else will never congregate at the feet of Jesus.

B. We shall not find the curious at the feet of Jesus, v. 9. These came to see Jesus and Lazarus out of curiosity but never honored nor served nor worshiped Him.

We must beware lest our coming to see Jesus is only curiosity, only a desire to go along with the crowd.

C. We shall not find the hypocrite at the feet of Jesus. Judas was indeed one of Jesus' disciples, but we do not find him at the feet of Jesus. Actually he was a thief, v. 6, who was also a hypocrite, who sought to cover up his thievery with a show of love for the poor.

In Judas we have a strong warning to avoid all hypocrisy in our practice of religion and all deception in our religious life. No hypocrite is ever at the feet of Jesus.

All these we shall not find at the feet of Jesus,

D. But we shall find all those who trust in Jesus as their Lord and Savior. Lazarus, Martha, and especially Mary. They believed in Him. In the realization of their sinfulness they turned to Jesus. Mary is outstanding in her faith because she believed that Jesus would die and be buried for her salvation. Her faith is a living faith that shows its life by its actions. — Faith in Jesus, a living faith, will place us likewise at the feet of Jesus.

On this Palm Sunday I ask you to place yourselves at the feet of Jesus.

Glendale, Mo.

LEWIS C. NIEMOELLER

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

ANTICREEDALISM AND CONFESSIONS

The Baptist periodical the *Watchman-Examiner* (August 14, 1952) editorializes on the value of Creeds, or Confessions, for keeping the doctrine pure and on the dangers of "anticreedalism" as allowing liberalism to gain the ascendancy in the Church. It advocates Creeds, or Confessions, against "anticreedalism," but again denounces "creedalism," or the trend to make Creeds, or Confessions, binding on those who hold membership in the Baptist denominations. The writer states that in insisting on "anticreedalism" and at the same time on Confessions, "there is no need of confusion," but to a non-Baptist his attitude certainly seems to be most confusing. Our Lutheran view of Confessions, or Creeds, is simple and logical. We accept Confessions not as "judges, as are the Holy Scriptures, but only as a symbol and declaration of the faith" (Formula of Concord, Epitome, "Of the Summary Content, Rule, and Standard," *Trigl. Conc.*, p. 777). Since our accepted Confessions, both particular and ecumenical, are, in our opinion, the declaration of the doctrine of Scripture on points in controversy, we ask everyone who wishes to teach or preach in Lutheran congregations or schools to subscribe to them *quia* and not merely *quatenus*, in other words, *because*, and not *in so far as they are* a declaration of God's Word, after the candidate has thoroughly studied and compared them with Scripture. His *quia* subscription should be a sincere profession of his own convictions. From this evangelical, yet frankly confessing, view all denominations differ that are opposed to Confessions, as the article shows. We read:

"Anticreedalism can be carried too far. It could arrive where it would mean the death of Christianity if enough people accepted it. Christianity is doctrine. It cannot be understood without doctrine. It cannot be taught without doctrine.

"Creedalism is not properly understood. It is too often classified with doctrinal requirement or teaching, which is something different. Historical creedalism is that ecclesiastical interpretation of Christianity which a church body may agree upon and then make legally binding upon not only its following, but other people, whether they be religious or not. Creedalism is not the same as a confession of faith. For instance, the Baptists have published more confessions of faith than any other religious body, but they have remained consistently

non-creedal. A confession of faith is not a legal document, nor can it be made legal for Baptists. They are tests of man's integrity. Most of our Baptist confessions are didactic in purpose as well as instruments for the promotion of homogeneity among Baptist people. But no Baptist can ever be confined legally to a confession of faith.

"This confusion between anticreedalism and a confession of faith has led to much misunderstanding. In the confusion, the advantage remains with the anticreedalists, particularly so among such a freedom-loving people as Baptists. Actually, there is no need for confusion. Both sides will believe in freedom to add to or to change the wording of any confession of faith. The most that can be attained is a general agreement to stand for certain truths. Anticreedalists, however, are frequently inclined to carry their conviction too far. For instance, last May the Rhode Island Congregational Conference took steps looking toward the elimination of doctrinal requirements by the higher levels of the world and national church council movements. They wish to work for 'the removal of doctrinal requirements.' While this may be a move to protect free churches from a theological basis for co-operation, it is a negative attitude in the field of Christian doctrine. It is in line with the demand that ordaining councils shall not operate on a theological basis, or that churches in associating themselves with other churches shall not be required to assent to a common doctrinal understanding.

"To assume that Christians can be together, work together, and propagate together without some common doctrinal basis is anything but reality. No cult or fraternity could exist three weeks on such a basis. Churches are teaching institutions. The distinctive denominations are separated on the basis of their beliefs. Their doctrine is the reason for their existence. Their ministries are their means of continuity. Ordinations are a means of a denomination's continuance and therefore it cannot ignore or deny those distinctives by which the denomination lives. A norm is absolutely necessary. Creedalism is objectionable, but when it is employed to deny or hinder a good confession of Christian faith it becomes at that point an enemy of Christianity itself." To us the writer's view makes no sense. While we reject such creedalism as we find it in Romanism and Romanizers, which goes beyond Scripture in its teachings and demands, the place given to Creeds or Confessions in Lutheranism seems to be the very point for which the article pleads. Otherwise they are mere "scraps of paper."

J. T. MUELLER

RELIGIOUS RACKETEERING

The *Lutheran Standard* (November 29, 1952) reports a type of religious racketeering that is evidently quite common in our metropolitan cities. We quote: "Pastor Robbin W. Skyles, Negro minister of the United Lutheran Church in Chicago, says that the church business is a racket among people of his race in that city. 'There are more than 1,500 store-front churches in Chicago,' according to Mr. Skyles, 'and many of them are really prostituting the people. . . . A man rents a store, buys a piano, and some folding chairs, finds some weird portion of the Bible on which to base his church beliefs. Then he ordains himself, sometimes a full bishop, and confers upon himself the degree of doctor of divinity, *summa cum laude*.' One such church recently gave its pastor a \$75,000 mansion, with the deed in the pastor's name, as an outright gift. The pastor then spent thousands of dollars of church funds to decorate the home in lavish style. 'As long as we have churches like that,' says Mr. Skyles, 'we'll never be able to replace the eight Negro pastors we have in the United Lutheran Church. Why should a man spend seven or eight years in training when he could go into one of these fly-by-night organizations and become wealthy in one year?'"

V. B.

THE CONTROVERSY REGARDING THE LORD'S SUPPER

Both within and without Lutheran Christendom the doctrine of the Lord's Supper today receives much consideration in church periodicals, books, conference discussions, and the like. The questions involved concern, on the one hand, the essence and purpose of the Holy Supper and, on the other, its use, in particular, its confessional character and therefore the problem of altar fellowship.

The *Lutheran* (October 29, 1952) in a book review takes issue with A. J. B. Higgins' recent study "The Lord's Supper in the New Testament," which "purports to offer the latest results of Biblical research regarding the Lord's Supper," and condemns the Catholic view that "is" must be taken literally, but has nothing to say of the Lutheran doctrine, while it holds that "the bread and wine of the Eucharist *represent* [italics in the review] the atoning sacrifice of Christ as the true Paschal Lamb without themselves presenting any inherent efficacy." In criticism of this the reviewer says: "It is at this point that there is a parting of the ways between Lutherans and Reformed. Martin Luther was not just being stubborn when he insisted, as over against Zwingli, that 'is' means *is*, rather than represents. He was insisting upon a thoroughly Scriptural truth, which was not only Scriptural, but

which had had a tremendous existential significance for Christians for nearly 1,500 years. The whole dynamic conception of the ever-living, ever-present, ongoing, victorious risen Christ, who said, 'Lo, I am with you alway,' was at stake." While this is true, there was at stake at Marburg for Luther, primarily and above all, the truth and reality of Christ's Communion promise: [Receive] My body and blood, given and shed for you for the remission of sins; in other words, the gracious assurance of forgiveness under the pledge of our Lord's true body and blood. Just that is what the Real Presence meant to Luther.

Dr. Uuras Saarnivaara in the *Lutheran Outlook* (July, 1952) discusses the doctrine of the Lord's Supper also with reference to the question of faith and confession. In the closing paragraph he points out the two reasons why Luther demanded that only professing Christians should be admitted to the Lord's Table: "First, it has been instituted for Christians only, and, secondly, it is a form of the profession of faith." He then writes: "When practically all members of the external Church are admitted, the Supper loses its character of confession of faith, and the boundary between believers and unbelievers is wiped away." Of unbelievers he says that they "should be excluded from the Sacrament of the Altar," because they "should be hindered from eating and drinking judgment unto themselves." "True love requires such severity in order that people would be led to repentance and true faith."

While Dr. Saarnivaara upholds the Biblical practice of altar fellowship, the *Lutheran Quarterly* (August, 1952) suggests "that the Lutheran Church will [as the writer hopes] abandon a certain inflexibility in the consideration of possible agreement among Christians as to the meaning of the Lord's Supper" (p. 291). In a following paragraph the article says: "We ought in all honesty realize that the doctrine of the Sacrament is not a revelation dating from the Wartburg [Marburg?], 1529, but a matter of a living Church which in the twentieth century may no longer be contained in the compartment of the sixteenth. We owe it to the Faith and Order movement that the hard ground of dogmatic controversy packed by the controversies of the past is being broken up and softened, so that out of barren areas of disagreement we may still hope for the cultivation of more attractive Christian statements. If, as we maintained at the outset, our doctrine is shaped, as to its form, by the surrounding forces which oppose it, then we may explore whether the present *form* [italics original] of our statement actually meet the conditions of our day, or if like some deserted building certain of our supports and beams no longer are held up by counter stresses or no longer carry any weight" (p. 293). Does that mean

that we must surrender the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper to please the Reformed and liberal elements in the ecumencial movement?

Later the writer says: "We cannot, if we be one with Him through the Sacrament, be complacent about the divisions which not only separate us from one another, but cause Him continuing grief and give the world cause to question the community of the saints" (*ibid.*). This statement ignores an important fact. It is not outward altar fellowship which makes communicants "one with Him," but the true faith in Christ and His Word that prompts believers to unity of profession. Separating divisions should be removed before altar fellowship takes place, as Dr. Saarnivaara rightly suggests. What displeases the Lord above all is departure from His Word, which results in divisions.

We ignore other recent publications on the controversy of the Lord's Supper. What has been quoted shows that Lutherans have every reason in the world to study anew what is Biblical and Lutheran on this point. Should there ever be a "United States Bad Boll Conference," Article VII of the Formula of Concord deserves a prominent place on the program of studies. And perhaps also Article VIII.

J. T. MUELLER

CONCLUDING POSTSCRIPTS

There were important conventions in 1952: the political conventions which nominated the presidential candidates, the conventions in Hanover and Lund, the conventions of the ULCA and ALC and the NCCCUSA. But there will be important conventions also in 1953. Among them, the triennial convention of our Synod in Houston can become, under God, a convention of the greatest significance for our own Church, for Lutheranism in general, and for our country. It can become that only, however, if all our people daily commend it to God and ask Him to endow those who are planning and those who will conduct the convention with a large measure of His Spirit.

* * *

Workshops which enable a group of interested experts to explore a problem area and to draft the results of their findings for the benefit of others have almost become a commonplace in our Church. A case in point is the Visitors' workshop which was conducted this past summer at our Teachers College in Seward under the leadership of Dr. Arnold H. Grumm. The printed proceedings of this workshop under the title *Visitors' Workshop* are now available and may be ordered from the College Bookstore in Seward. Price per copy is

75 cents. It is a modest 38-page booklet but is packed with data. It is thoroughly grounded in Scripture, our Confessions, and our own literature. We can best indicate the direction of thought in this booklet by listing the chapter headings. These are: the Visitor; the Visitor's circuit; the Visitor and the District President; the Visitor and the official visit; the Visitor and the pastor; the Visitor and the teacher; the Visitor and the congregation; the Visitor makes his official visit; the Visitor co-ordinates his program; suggestions. We underscore in particular the observation of President Fuerbringer, who writes in the preface: "Concordia Teachers College of Seward is convinced that the investment which Synod has made on the campus will bring even greater returns if the facilities are used for various types of in-service training for pastors and teachers and for the training of the laity for church work."

* * *

Recently we heard Missionary Fred M. Schalow tell about his experiences in Red China, of the loss of our church property in China, of his trial, imprisonment, and release, and of the horrifying conditions in a Red China prison. His story fully corroborates what some of us have heard in Germany as reported to us by Lutheran pastors in the Eastern Zone. The philosophy of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin underlies the political and educational structure of every country controlled by Communism. Certainly there can be and there are Christians in these countries. But it is impossible for Christians in these countries to establish and maintain their own Christian schools and Christian institutions of higher learning and to engage in home and foreign mission programs. Let it be said from the housetops: Where Stalin reigns, Christians must be prepared to suffer and to die for their faith!

* * *

The 119th meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which was held in St. Louis from December 26 to 31, attracted hundreds of scientists from all parts of the country. Some 1,500 scientific papers were read embracing virtually all branches of modern science. It was reported that since 1940 the number of scientists both in our country and in Russia had doubled. It was not without significance that the first general symposium was devoted to the general subject "Disaster Recovery." There could be no doubt that the American people are being prepared also by the scientists for atomic war, which will result in disasters worse than our country has known. The meetings were further evidence of the phenomenal progress of science since the days of Descartes and Galileo. Yet, though modern science

has done much to make life more comfortable, it has also accelerated man's living pace. It has helped to save the lives of infants and young children and to lengthen the lives of those who have safely crossed the threshold of seventy. But it has been unable to arrest the steadily rising mortality rate especially among men between forty and sixty. "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" (Mark 8:36.)

* * *

In this writer's opinion the *Lutheran Quarterly* hit the jack-pot in its November issue, in which it featured Bishop Berggrav's address delivered at Hannover on "State and Church—the Lutheran View," an article by Edwin T. Greninger on "Is *Munificentissimus Deus* [the encyclical in which Pope Pius XII defined it to be a divinely revealed dogma that the Virgin Mary was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory] a Purely Theological Document?" and another penetrating article by Martin J. Heinicker on "Luther and the 'Orders of Creation' in Relation to a Doctrine of Work and Vocation." All three articles are of such significance that every Lutheran theologian ought to read and think on these things.

* * *

Religion in Life (Winter) contains a challenging, though overenthusiastic, article on television ("The Church Must Use Television" by Charles Brackbill, Jr.). In a concluding paragraph the author says: "Television offers us the opportunity to interpret the Christian Gospel, through many different forms, to millions of Americans who never enter a church. There are people whose own doors are closed to a direct or formal approach from the church. But television goes through closed doors. 'For the church of the twentieth century not to make extensive use of both television and radio would be as unthinkable as if Paul had refused to travel in ships or Luther and Calvin had regarded the printing press as unworthy of use,' cautions Dr. Clayton Griswold."

* * *

Our final postscript in the second issue of 1953 is a quote from Blaise Pascal, eminent French philosopher and mathematician (d. 1662): "Not only do we know God by Jesus Christ alone, but we know ourselves only by Jesus Christ. We know life and death only by Jesus Christ. Apart from Jesus Christ we do not know what is our life, nor our death, nor God, nor ourselves. Thus without the Scripture, which has Christ alone for its object, we know nothing and see only darkness and confusion in the nature of God and in our own nature."

P. M. B.

BRIEF ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

At the annual Reformation festival sponsored by the Greater Minneapolis Council of Churches the Canon of the Washington Episcopal Cathedral, Dr. Theodore Wedel, stated some truths that must strike many Protestants with a disagreeably hard impact. "As the churches of the Reformation," he said, "once spoke words of judgment upon the great Church of Rome, so that Church may today be the servant of God in voicing judgment upon us. Catholic America is still found at church on Sunday morning. It still honors the Ten Commandments and still fears God. Can the same be said of Protestant America, or at least that large section of it which has turned half pagan? The Pope is clearly still a better guide to morals than is Hollywood. Catholic America still believes in Christian education. Protestant America, so it seems, has abandoned her schools. Protestantism revolted against a totalitarian Church. Well and good. But if totalitarian Christianity is wrong, churchless Christianity can be worse. Protestantism has come close, at times, to churchless individualism, every man for himself — church attendance taken lightly and the very concept of a visible church, with sacraments and a corporate worship, belittled. The great definition of the Church in the historic creeds as One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic should not be a monopoly of Rome." — Without fully subscribing to every statement — there is food for thought!

* * *

Two American missionaries were murdered in western New Guinea sometime in October. The victims were identified as the Rev. Walter J. Erikson and the Rev. Edward R. Trist, both commissioned by the Evangelical Alliance Mission of Chicago, Ill., an interdenominational agency supported by a number of fundamentalist churches. The missionaries were on an exploratory trip into one of the world's least-known areas when they were killed. The Netherlands Embassy has stated that a full investigation of the circumstances will be made; it was said that hostile natives were suspected of the crime, but that the missionaries had evidently been deserted by their carriers under circumstances "not yet explained" . . . The fiancées of the two men, who were to have joined them in New Guinea next spring, will still go out to work in the field there.

* * *

A World Methodist Convocation on Evangelism will be held June 26 to 28, 1953, in Philadelphia to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the birth of John Wesley. More than 3,500 delegates from Methodist groups in the United States and overseas are expected.

Again: Pedro Cardinal Segura y Saenz, Archbishop of Seville. This time he censured two American Roman Catholic publications for taking exception to the pastoral letter he issued last spring warning against the "Protestant danger" in Spain and objecting to the government's "tolerance" toward Protestants. The criticized publications are *America*, the national Jesuit weekly magazine, and the *Indiana Catholic and Record* of the Indianapolis archdiocese. *America* had asserted that there was an "ethical duty" for religious freedom in Spain. The Indiana paper declared that in refusing to allow complete religious freedom, Spain "gives the impression of living four centuries behind in questions of religious peace and concord." The Cardinal said he was not surprised that his letter had brought Protestant protests, but that it was "indeed strange that an attempt to challenge our pastoral letter, which laid down the doctrine of the Church, should appear in a review published by the Society of Jesus in New York." He called it incomprehensible, and considered it "necessary to denounce this grave circumstance, that the review in question should on its own account judge and criticize a pastoral document published in an official church bulletin by an archbishop and cardinal of the Holy Roman Church. By law, bishops have doctrinal authority in their dioceses, and over this doctrinal authority there is no other supreme judge than the Holy See. Mere members and priests and religious cannot legitimately set themselves up as judges of doctrine over prelates. . . . The *America* article constitutes a real overstepping of authority which has caused spiritual harm to Catholics." — Cracking the whip? Where does the Vatican stand on this issue?

* * *

A storm cloud in the East? — A reddish-brown wooden gate that has not been opened in more than a hundred years is the center of a politico-religious dispute between Greeks and Turkish Moslems. The gate is one of three entrances to the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul, Turkey; it was sealed as a memorial after Ecumenical Patriarch Gregorius was hanged above it in 1821 by order of the tyrant Sultan Mahmud. The average Moslem, who works and lives peacefully with the Greek Orthodox minority, did not even know there was a sealed gate at the Patriarchate. Now a Moslem newspaper, *Her Gun*, has published a series of vitriolic editorials against the Patriarchate, demanding that the gate be opened as an expression of Patriarch Athenagoras' friendship for Turkey (the Ecumenical Patriarch is the spiritual head of Greek Orthodoxy). *Her Gun* threatens "sensational revelations" against the Patriarchate if the gate is not opened within a month. . . . *Her Gun* is the mouthpiece of reactionary Moslem groups who resent

the government's easing of former religious restrictions on former "infidel" minorities. For instance, last year the government permitted the Patriarch to reopen the Orthodox Church Theological School in Turkey. Students from many parts of the world, including the United States, now study there. . . . Again, a small Athens newspaper, *Akropolis*, suggested that Istanbul's famed cathedral Saint Sophia, now a museum, be returned to the Orthodox Church for use as a cathedral. Saint Sophia was converted into a mosque after the Ottoman conquest of the city (then named Constantinople) in 1453. After World War I it was turned into a museum to improve relations between the new Turkish republic and Greece. The suggestion of the *Akropolis* writer was taken as an insult by some Turkish papers. One editor saw a "pan-Slav plot" behind it. Extremist Moslem papers seized the opportunity to demand that Saint Sophia be made a mosque again.

* * *

The Seattle convention of the United Lutheran Church in America raised the minimum pensions for disabled and retired pastors to \$900 a year and for pastors' widows to \$450.

* * *

Anent the widespread complaint about juvenile delinquency a timely note was sounded by Dr. Marcus C. Rieke, youth director of the American Lutheran Church at the ALC convention in Waverly, Iowa. "No one should sell youth short," he said. "There lies deep in the consciousness of our young people a seriousness of purpose that belies what is often apparent in youth behavior. Many young people are today choosing their life's work carefully, prayerfully, and with determination that in their decision they will honor Christ and serve Him and fellow men in and through that decision. That is why there are so many youths preparing for the Gospel service. Youths are coming in ever larger numbers to serve as pastors, parish workers, social workers, Christian day school teachers, Christian nurses, musicians, secretaries, religious educational directors, and in numerous other church activities."

* * *

According to the Vatican Radio, the Communists in Poland are using Hitler's tactics to wean the youth away from their Church. The Communist-controlled Society of Friends of Children organizes special meetings and outings to clash with the time of church services in order to keep the children away from Mass and other religious services. In Warsaw alone, it is said, the Society directs 37 schools of all types in which a completely atheistic education is given. . . . Some 80,000

Polish children have been given special indoctrination courses in the schools run by the Society, 5,000 more than last year, the increase due solely to the pressure the Polish Communist Party is exerting on parents because the children continue to attend church services with their parents.

* * *

Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin, head of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKID), told a meeting of the Berlin-Brandenburg Synod of the Church in West Berlin how the Church's operations had been hamstrung by the closing of the border between West Berlin and the surrounding Soviet Zone. The border was blocked last June by the East German Communist government. Two thirds of the Synod's six million members are in the Soviet Zone; but of the entire Berlin-Brandenburg church administration, which has been in West Berlin for many years, only he and Dean Heinrich Grueber were allowed to visit the Soviet Zone parishes. The Church tried to set up central administration offices in the Soviet sector of Berlin, but so far the East German Communist government has refused to issue necessary licenses. It has also refused to give residence permits for West Berlin church officials who were ready to move into the new administration offices. One home mission building after another in the Soviet Zone has been taken away from the Church on the pretext that it is Western property. Church relief work in the Soviet sector has been paralyzed by the sealing of the border.

* * *

A group of Korean Christian printers, editors, and scholars are working by candlelight in Pusan, Korea, to speed the publication of the first Bible in Hankul, modern colloquial Korean. Dr. Young-Bin Im, general secretary of the Korean Bible Society, said that the printing of the New Testament had been completed and the Old Testament should be off the presses around January 1. . . . Both the Korean tongue and the symbols devised in recent years to transliterate its sounds phonetically into script are called Hankul. It was adopted as the official language when the Republic of Korea was established. Prior to the Japanese occupation of 1905—45 the Korean spoken language was rendered in print by using Chinese characters. The Japanese forbade the printed use of this language and during the later occupation years even prohibited its spoken use. . . . Because the Hankul Bible is the first major work to be printed in the new national script, its publication has great significance for Koreans. Scholars generally expect it to set standards for the new language,

much as other Bibles have done in various lands since the days of Gutenberg. . . . Korean Christian scholars who made the translation worked basically from an old diglot King James version, but also used original Greek and Hebrew texts, including many newly discovered manuscripts made available to them by the American Bible Society. Officials of the American group said in New York that nearly \$140,000 had been allocated this year for completion of the Hankul Bible and the distribution of Scriptures in Korea. . . . Work on the Hankul Bible was begun shortly after the end of World War II, and the translation was virtually completed when South Korea was invaded in 1950. It was the only item saved from Bible House when Seoul fell, and it was smuggled out of the Korean capital by Dr. Im and buried in earthen jars. Recovered when U.N. forces regained the Seoul area, the manuscripts were taken to Tokyo, where the translation was completed and whence it was brought to Pusan to be printed.

* * *

Six railroads in Mississippi are transporting, without charge, shipments of gift food, clothing, and other commodities to various charitable institutions in the State. Mississippi's churches sponsored collections of potatoes, canned fruits, vegetables, cane syrup, and good used clothing during the Thanksgiving and Christmas season. One orphanage, under this arrangement, received about 100 tons of supplies.

* * *

Four hundred Protestant ministers and laymen have asked the President to withhold financial aid from Spain, also that "no consideration be given to an alliance" between Spain and the United States "until the Spanish government establishes full civil rights and freedom of faith and worship in Spain." A pastoral letter (previously cited in these columns) of Pedro Cardinal Segura y Saenz, Archbishop of Seville, was quoted by the group, in which Spaniards were cautioned against "tolerance and benevolence toward Protestants." . . . Five hundred additional signatures were received since the letter was sent to the President, and the group is seeking additional names.

* * *

Officials of the Berlin-Brandenburg Synod of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKID) have been informed by Mayor Friedrich Ebert of East Berlin that his Soviet sector administration will discontinue collecting church taxes. . . . Traditionally, church taxes have been collected in Germany by municipal authorities, who compute them as a surcharge on individual income taxes and turn over the totals

obtained to the respective churches. The amounts so collected are the most important and largest single item in the budgets of the various churches. . . . An EKID request that the Soviet sector authorities rescind the order, which was issued without consulting church officials, was rejected by Mayor Ebert. Church authorities in Berlin denounced the action as "another Communist attempt to hamper church life." Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin, EKID head, said the order would have "very serious consequences" because it confronted the Church with the necessity of setting up its own tax administration. This, he said, would not only be a heavy financial burden upon the Church, but presented a very serious organizational problem.

* * *

One of the 24 new cardinals lately appointed by Pope Pius XII is an American, Archbishop J. Francis A. McIntyre of Los Angeles. He is the fourth cardinal in the United States. . . . The College of Cardinals by these appointments, was brought back to full strength, 70 members; 27 of them are Italians, 43 non-Italians.

* * *

According to reports in London, the abbreviation "A. D." (Anno Domini) has been abolished in Iron Curtain countries because of its Christian connotation. When the Communist press publishes an article containing a reference to, say, the fifth century A. D., it uses the phrase, "the fifth century of our era."

* * *

It has been estimated that a new cardinal of the Roman Church must spend at least \$3,000 for a minimum wardrobe of traditional vestments and might spend a great deal more. Now Pope Pius XII has issued a "*motu proprio*" decree to change the vestments to make them more modern and less expensive. It said that "in consideration of the present times, which have been rendered grave and difficult," the world situation enjoins "a sober tenor of life upon all and a measured and austere one particularly upon the clergy." So a simplification of the cardinal's costume is expected to cut the cost by about \$1,000. The long trains of the cardinals' red capes—traditionally 23 feet long and carried by bearers—are said to be reduced to half this length and worn folded at the back so as to dispense with the need for train bearers. Vestments henceforth are to be of wool rather than silk. . . . The cardinal's ring is a gift of the Pope; it weds him to the Church. — May a Protestant say that time and money and official consideration might more profitably be devoted to other matters!

The German Evangelical Church in the Polish-occupied part of Silesia has virtually become "a church without clergy." There are about 40,000 Protestants in some 100 scattered parishes in the area; but they are served by only two pastors, both of them ailing and over-worked. Services and religious classes are being held by laymen and women, who are thus keeping up a "primitive religious life." . . . Before World War II, the Evangelical Church in Silesia was one of the most prosperous in Germany; it had 2,300,000 members and 734 parishes, served by over 900 pastors. After the war the bulk of the former province of Silesia located east of the Oder-Neisse River line was annexed by Poland and officially yielded early in 1951 by the Communist government of the (East) German Democratic Republic. . . . The Evangelical Church in Polish Silesia is now a laymen's Church, without clerical leadership or a proper church management. The Church receives no financial support from the state, and there are no organizational facilities for collecting church taxes. Expenses are covered entirely by contributions from the faithful.

* * *

After an eight-year effort to join Lutheran bodies in Canada in a co-operative organization a Canadian Lutheran Council was established in Winnipeg, Man. Member groups are the Canadian branches of the United Lutheran Church in America; the American Lutheran Church; the Evangelical Lutheran Church (of Norwegian origin); the Augustana Synod (of Swedish origin); the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the Lutheran Free Church. . . . The Council will co-ordinate the efforts of the six groups in such activities as world relief, home missions, ministerial training, social and welfare work, and recruitment for the military chaplaincy. Administration of these activities will be directed by the Rev. W. A. Mehlenbacker of Hamilton, Ont., as full-time executive secretary, from an office in Winnipeg. The Rev. Mars A. Dale of Saskatoon, Sask., was elected first president of the Council.

* * *

At the second General Assembly of the National Council of Churches in Denver, Colo., a 34-member appraisal committee headed by Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of Washington, D. C., submitted a report praising most Council programs and activities and containing, among others, these items: The constituent Churches of the Council have some 34,000,000 members. The Council operates as a Council and has shown "no apparent disposition to assume the functions of a Church." The creation of the Council has brought about

gains in expanding technical services, such as recruitment, research, and audio-visual aids; in relating the functional interests (missions, education, etc.) to one another and to the life of the Churches; in effecting reasonable uniformity of procedure among units that formerly were autonomous; in facilitating consultation and co-operation between units. The committee urged greater lay and non-professional representation in the Assembly, the General Board, and on Council commissions and committees, pointing out that clergymen made up 85 per cent of the 125-member General Board, and that 64 per cent of the 3,500 members of the Assembly, the General Board, and the various commissions and committees were full-time employees of religious organizations. They deplored this "tendency" to expect "religious professionals" to carry too heavy a share of Council responsibilities. The burden should be "jointly carried by professionals and laity."

* * *

Bishop Otto Dibelius, head of the EKID in Germany, addressed the Assembly of the National Council of Churches in Denver, Colo. He said that God has made Germany a battlefield in the big fight between Christian civilization and the materialistic religion of Communism. "We realize," he said, "that it is a fatal question for all the world whether we Christians in Germany withstand and finally win, or whether we succumb to the materialistic philosophy of the East. Nobody can relieve us of this responsibility. Nobody can help us in this decisive question. A religion can be conquered only through another religion which proves to be stronger. Communism will be conquered only through the Christian faith." Church services in East Germany are better attended than ever before, although Communist tactics frequently force the people to work on Sundays. The number of church workers constantly increases. There are fewer convinced Communists in East Germany than there are in West Germany; "in the West people know only the Communist program; in the East they know the Communist regime; to them it is a harsh reality." But, he warned, in ten years the situation may change, because "Communist propaganda is not entirely without effect, especially among youth. The youth is the target group for their propaganda. Young people are put in responsible positions. It is not extraordinary that a 22-year-old becomes mayor of a town of 100,000 people. There are railway stations designated as railway stations of Free German Youth. There the station-master may be 18 years of age, and all who work with him are younger. Such things impress youth. Therefore the whole ire of the Communists is poured out on youth work of the church. They have not yet dared

to prohibit our youth work completely, as has been done in Russia, for example. But youth work is restricted to small meetings in parish rooms. Until now, however, the members of the religious youth groups have succeeded in meeting in large numbers. There is a trait of joy and valor among these church youths. This is a test for them. Each day means a new confession of faith. And they do it, too."

* * *

Last year an organization of West German Roman Catholics was formed to boycott theaters showing offensive motion pictures, similar to the League of Decency in our country. Its members pledge not to attend movies which are contrary to Christian faith and morals, and further, to stay away from movie theaters which show such films. They have marked their first victory. A movie theater owner brought action in the district court in Muenchen-Gladbach, a British Zone city, to restrain the league from inducing its members to boycott his theater. The court upheld the league. "Although such a boycott constitutes damage to the business of the theater," the court said, "the protection of Christian belief and morals weighs more heavily than economic considerations." Catholic sources attach widespread importance to the ruling which they interpret as "official recognition of the citizens' right to ward off assaults on public morals."

* * *

The greater mission field today for American Churches lies in the Armed Forces, Chaplain (Maj. Gen.) Charles J. Carpenter, Air Force Chief of Chaplains, told delegates to the Assembly of the National Council of Churches in Denver. "A great many of the young men and women who are coming into the Armed Forces are religiously illiterate. If we send them into areas of the world and into situations that will test their best moral understanding, and if we fail to do something about their moral and spiritual protection and development, then we can have as a result a national religious tragedy as well as a personal spiritual tragedy. It is a necessity that the Christian Church today recognize that it must make a definite contribution to these young men while they are in military service not only for the purpose of producing worth-while Christian youth in the military, but that we might hold them close to the Church so that when they return, at the rate of a million a year, they will come back to the Church as active members; men and women who are leaders of the laity of the Christian Church of tomorrow. The time has come when the Church as a national institution must have a planned program administered to the youth in the military service."

THEO. HOYER

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

CRITICISM AND FAITH. By John Knox. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York, 1952. 126 pages and index, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. \$1.75.

Prof. Knox, who teaches in the New Testament department of Union Theological Seminary, New York, presents herewith an *apologia* dedicated to the proposition: "Biblical historical criticism not only has no stranglehold on Christian faith, but does not have it in its power to destroy one jot or one tittle of the gospel" (p. 21). This he seeks to show by removing from the field of criticism those facts of faith, like the Resurrection (p. 40), which have often been the target of negative attacks; by relating the New Testament to the Church (p. 26) and the continuing activity of the Spirit (p. 52); and by the declaration that "the gospels are not to be looked at but to be looked through, and one cannot do this adequately until one is ready and able to allow accurately for the defects of the medium" (p. 77).

For Lutherans, most of whom have yet to face the existential issues which Knox discusses here, this presentation will probably solve very few problems. It may be more helpful for those churches which have passed through the conflict over liberalism, but they, too, would ask many questions that Knox does not answer.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

INSTRUCTION IN CHRISTIAN LOVE (1523). By Martin Bucer, translated by Paul Traugott Fuhrmann. John Knox Press, Richmond, 1952. 68 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. \$1.50.

Of the major Reformation figures the two most seriously neglected by American historical scholarship have probably been Bucer and Zwingli. It is a good sign that American Presbyterians and other Calvinists have begun to pay attention especially to Bucer, who was perhaps Calvin's foremost teacher.

This slim volume is a translation of Bucer's *Das ybm selbs niemand sonder anderen leben soll. vnd wie der mensch dahyn kummen mög*, Bucer's first book. The treatise was intended for lay consumption, and its central theme is that preoccupation with ethics, both personal and social, which predominated in Bucer's thought. Because of its audience the essay makes extensive use of Biblical materials and it avoids extreme polemics.

For just that reason it seems unfortunate that the editor felt obliged to burden so modest a writing with all of 236 footnotes! Most of them

are merely references to the original German text, some are helpful explanations, and a few provide bibliographical material. In these latter Mr. Fuhrmann has ignored the work of the two leading Bucer scholars in America, Hastings Eells and Wilhelm Pauck.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

THE PROGRESS OF DOGMA. By James Orr. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, 1952. 360 pages and index. $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. \$3.50.

CREEDS IN THE MAKING. A Short Introduction to the History of Christian Doctrine. By Allan Richardson. S. C. M. Press, London, 1951. 130 pages and index. $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. 10s, 6d.

TEXTBOOK OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. By Reinhold Seeberg, translated by Charles E. Hay. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1952. 2 volumes in one, 388 and 466 pages and indices. $6 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. \$6.75.

The appearance of these books is in many ways a *testimonium pauperatis* for American studies in the history of Christian thought. For one thing, none is by an American; they come, respectively, from Scotland, England, and Germany. But even more serious is the fact that all three are reprints, Orr's book having been published in 1901 and Seeberg's in 1898!

The Progress of Dogma consists of a series of lectures delivered by the well-known Glasgow theologian, James Orr, when he visited the United States in 1897. Its principal target is the *Dogmengeschichte* of Adolf Harnack, in opposition to which Orr sets his own interpretation of the genetic development of Christian doctrine. The term "progress" ought not to summon up the spectres of *Lehrfortbildung*, for by it Orr meant merely that there has been a growth in the Church's perception of the full implications of the original Christian message. Though the most recent of the three books — it first appeared in 1935 — Richardson's *Creeds in the Making* is in many ways the least satisfying. It was written for non-theological readers, and this may account for its apologetic tone. But it reveals the embarrassment with which many theologians of Great Britain handle traditional dogma; in a dogmatic work this embarrassment is dangerous, in a historical work it can be fatal.

Seeberg's *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* will always be a classic in the field and is, next to Harnack, the most important treatment of the subject matter to date. The depletion of the Hay translation made necessary a reprint or a translation of the more recent editions. Perhaps for reasons of economy, Baker Book House has chosen the former course and given us a work which, while it does not contain the improvements and expansions of later editions, nevertheless provides the English-speaking public with a useful guide to the history of Christian thought until the Reformation. It is to be hoped that one or another of the histories of doctrine now under preparation by American scholars will soon appear to fill in the serious gaps left by these older works.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

THE LUTHERAN ENTERPRISE IN INDIA 1706—1952. Edited by C. H. Swavely. Published by the Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India, 1952. 252 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, with a map.

As far as I know, there is no book which will so effectively acquaint a person with the work of the Lutheran Church in India both as to its origin and its ramified developments as the present one. The publication is a symposium; the contributors are representatives of the various Lutheran bodies or missions in India. The section on the work done by our own church body is a very well written and delightfully informative account from the pen of Prof. H. Earl Miller of the seminary in Nagercoil. One cannot help being deeply moved by the description of the endeavors, successes, sorrows, and disappointments of the first Lutheran missionaries in India, Ziegenbalg and Pluetschau, who arrived there in 1706, the first Protestant emissaries of the eternal Gospel of free grace in that country. All honor to these heroes of the faith, of whom the former, after prodigious labors, died at the early age of 31. In their footsteps have come many other worthy, self-denying servants of the Lord, some of whom had to labor with very little visible success, especially in Mohammedan fields. That it is the Lord who gives the increase, and that often we have nothing but His promises to cheer us, no tangible results, no manifestation of gratitude, no "jailer of Philippi" experience, is attested on a number of pages of this book. The reader is introduced to the difficulties and problems of the missionaries, and to the different views taken on some mission policies, whether, for instance, the chief emphasis should be laid on preaching or on the work in the schools, and whether admission to the secondary schools should be confined to Christian pupils or whether they should be open to all classes. The manuscripts for most of the chapters of the book apparently had to be submitted as early as 1949, and hence there is no notice here of the new work of our Church among the Mohammedans of India nor of the addition of Dr. W. F. Bulle to our medical force. The number of Lutherans in that country is given as 557,605.

WILLIAM F. ARNDT

PREACHING TO PREACHERS. By Norman A. Madson. Lutheran Synod Book Co., Mankato, Minn. 208 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$. \$2.50, net.

Prof. Norman A. Madson, D.D., Dean of Bethany Lutheran Seminary of Mankato, Minn., is widely known as a preacher in Synodical Conference circles. He delivered the 23 sermons included in the present volume at graduation exercises of schools and theological seminaries within the Synodical Conference, at various pastoral conferences, and at ordination services. While his sermons will be enjoyed also by members of the laity, they will offer comfort, courage, and strength particularly to our clergy. Although the jacket of the volume states that "some of his statements may sound unduly harsh," the present reviewer must admit that this was not his reaction. We need outspoken Jeremiahs, Peters, and

Luthers in our pulpits, for the days in which we live are evil indeed. It is heartening to read sermons which come straight from the shoulder, which make no attempts to be ambiguous or sugar-coated, but which at the same time radiate evangelical warmth and clerical integrity. That Luther is quoted in practically every sermon is not surprising, for Professor Madson has been an omnivorous reader and student of the blessed Reformer for many years. Striking illustrations and quotations abound in his sermons, as do also pertinent hymn stanzas. Professor Madson regrets that too little preaching of our day is directed against the evils and treachery of Roman Catholicism; on the other hand, we must add that, though necessary, such preaching too often prevents us from seeing the beam that is in our own eye. We too often concentrate on the evils of Rome and fail to see the antichrists which slink and lurk in the secularism, materialism, Pharisaism, self-complacency, hatreds, and worldly corruption found in very much American Protestantism of today. We often take it out on Rome when we should rather bear in mind the words of Martin Luther to the Reformed theologian Zwingli: "Ye are of a different spirit than we." — Professor Madson's introductory chapters on "Homemade Homiletics" and "Scriptural Subjectivity" offer several good suggestions to pastors and preachers.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

DIE LEHRE VON DER SEELENSORGE. Von Eduard Thurneysen. Christian Kaiser Verlag, Muenchen, 1948. 306 S., 6×9.

Dr. Thurneysen, a 64-year-old professor at the University of Basel and an associate of Karl Barth, has rendered a significant service in this volume on pastoral care. Every month new books are appearing which go into the historical development and the method of pastoral care. This book differs in that it bases the objectives and the scope of this work on a consideration of the Church and man.

He develops his thoughts under three major divisions:

- I. Die Begründung der Seelsorge
- II. Wesen und Gestalt der Seelsorge
- III. Der Vollzug der Seelsorge

Beginning with a sketchy outline of theology, he proceeds to show the objective of the Practical — "die Gewinnung von Menschen fuer das Reich Christi und seine Gemeinde auf Erden." In working toward this objective, the soul of the individual must be understood as the total person, which recognizes the difference between body and soul and the unity of body and soul.

Seelsorge becomes, then, as Dr. Thurneysen calls it, a "Gespraech," an interpersonal relationship between pastor and congregation and/or individuals in which there is a mutual exchange for the purpose of drawing the people into a closer relationship to Christ, which manifests itself in growing sanctification.

To accomplish this "*Gespraech*" most effectively, Dr. Thurneysen points out the value of an understanding of psychology, an understanding of people, their actions and reactions. He shows illness is a result of man's relationship to God—sin, which affects his total being. Therefore the *Seelsorger* has a function at the sickbed, but this does not make the *Seelsorger* the therapist in that he uses special methods of treatment belonging in the field of psychiatry or medicine but continues to build the spiritual life by use of the means of grace.

For me the climax of this book came in the last chapter where Dr. Thurneysen lists qualifications for the *Seelsorger*. Beginning with "Seelsorge ist ein Dienst, der nicht in eigner Kraft und Vernunft erfüllt werden kann. Es ist ja das Wort Gottes, das zur Ausrichtung kommen soll," he proceeds to develop his thesis: "Der Seelsorger ist Traeger und Uebermittler der Botschaft von der Vergebung. Er handelt nicht in eigner Kraft und Vernunft, sondern aus Berufung. Dazu muss er selber im Wort und in der Gemeinde wurzeln und aus dem Glauben an die Vergebung leben. Er soll die Menschen nicht an sich, aber er darf sie an den Herrn der Kirche binden, indem er sie zum Worte führt und für sie in Gebet verharrt."

This is a much-needed book in the field of pastoral care, since it deals with the function of the pastor in a Scriptural, positive orientation which recognizes the skills of other professions in healing people but assigns to the pastor the duty of using the means of grace, through which the power of God is brought into the lives of people in establishing them in a relationship to God for temporal and eternal value.

The author's association with Barth is noticeable, but does not detract from the value of the book. It is refreshing to read a book on pastoral care which takes Scripture and the ministry, Church and man, into account without giving the impression that the pastor's first responsibility and only objective is the temporal security and well-being of his counselees.

EDWARD MAHNKE

EW

ints
of
an's
the
eel-
ing
ual

Dr.
eel-
elt
ll,"
er-
raft
nd
en.
der
bet

als
ich
the
of
on-

act
ral
ent
nd
es.